University of Alberta

REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS' STANDARDS FOR THE BEHAVIOUR OF STUDENTS WITH BEHAVIOUR DISORDERS

by

HEIDI MARIE MOEN

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF EDUCATION

in

SPECIAL EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Edmonton, Alberta

FALL 2000

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-59760-1

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: HEIDI MARIE MOEN

Title of Thesis: REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS' STANDARDS FOR THE BEHAVIOUR OF STUDENTS WITH BEHAVIOUR DISORDERS

Degree: MASTER OF EDUCATION

Year this Degree Granted: 2000

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

c/o 2 Garden Crescent

Sherwood Park, Alberta

T8A 2N8

April 26, 2000

Date

Abstract

Students with emotional and/or behavioural disorders (EBD) are the group of students most likely to be served within segregated educational settings. To achieve the responsible integration of students with EBD, the standards teachers hold for the behaviour of these students must be identified. The first step in this process is to determine whether teacher standards for behaviour differ by educational settings. The present study utilized the Classroom Participation Scale: Teacher Standards Instrument (CPS: TSI), developed by Tannenbaum and Muscott (1986), to determine whether elementary teachers had different standards for the behaviour of students with EBD. The study extended the work of Muscott (1996) by surveying regular education teachers and comparing their ratings for the behaviour of students with EBD to the ratings of special education teachers. Fifty-one teachers from 11 schools in a large Western metropolitan area were surveyed to determine their perceptions and ratings of behaviour. Teachers from both general education classrooms and from specialized behaviour classrooms were surveyed. The results indicated that teachers within regular education settings had significantly higher standards for the behaviour of students with EBD than special education teachers. The results have implications for the successful integration of students with EBD into less restrictive educational settings. The findings of this study were in agreement with other research in this area.

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled REGULAR AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS' STANDARDS FOR THE BEHAVIOUR OF STUDENTS WITH BEHAVIOUR DISORDERS submitted by HEIDI MARIE MOEN in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF EDUCATION IN SPECIAL EDUCATION.

Dr. J. S. Goldberg

Dr. E. W. Romaniuk

Dr. K. L. Ward

April 26, 2000
Date

For my mother -
For teaching me the value
of learning.

For my father -
For guiding and encouraging
my dreams.

For Michael -
For believing in me.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to give thanks to the following people:

Dr. Goldberg, my supervisor. Thank you for your support, guidance, and encouragement with respect to this endeavor.

Dr. Romaniuk. Thank you for your input and for your assistance with my statistical analysis. I admire your dedication to your students and thank you for your support over the past two years.

Dr. Ward. Thank you for your time and interest.

Dr. Muscott. Thank you for allowing me to utilize your questionnaire and for your assistance during the completion of this project.

To my family. I love and care for each of you deeply. Thank you for all of the laughter, love, and respect. Your support has been inspirational.

To my aunt Rita. Thank you for expecting the best from me.

To the most wonderful friends – Leanne, Chris, and Juli. I am truly blessed to have each of you in my life. The patience and love you have shown me has made all the difference.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. LITERATURE REVIEW 6

Standardized Definition of Emotional and Behavioural Disorder (EBD) 6

Characteristics of Students with EBD 7

Education Settings for Students with EBD 9

Challenges to Integration 12

Successful Integration 15

Why Integrate? 17

Integration of Students with EBD 18

Factors Related to the Decision to Integrate 18

Factors Related to the Success of Integration 28

Conclusion 36

Research Objectives 37

III. METHODOLOGY 38

Participants 38

Instrument 39

Procedure 40

IV. RESULTS 42

Statistical Procedures 42

General Characteristics of the Participants 42

Summary of Findings 53

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS 54

Introduction 54

General Education Teachers 55
Teacher Standards for Behaviour 55
Teaching Experience and Standards for Behaviour 57
Concluding Statements 57
Special Education Teachers 58
Teacher Standards for Behaviour 58
Gender and Age of Special Education Teachers and Standards for Behaviour 59
Concluding Statements 60
Limitations of Present Study 60
Implications for Practice 62
Additional Supports for Children with EBD 64
Teacher Variables 64
Implications for Future Research 65
Conclusions 65
REFERENCES 68
APPENDIX A: Letter of Permission to Utilize Questionnaire 74
APPENDIX B: Introduction Letter 75
APPENDIX C: Research Consent Form 78
APPENDIX D: Background Information Form 80
APPENDIX E: Classroom Participation Scale: Teacher Standards Instrument 82
APPENDIX F: Mean Questionnaire Item Ratings 90

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

TABLE 1: Gender, Age, and Level of Education of Regular and Special Education Teachers 43

TABLE 2: Total Years Teaching, Total Years Teaching in Current Position, and Total Years Teaching Students with EBD for Regular and Special Education Teachers 45

TABLE 3: Mean Total Questionnaire Score for Regular and Special Education Teachers 47

TABLE 4: Mean Total Questionnaire Score for Male and Female Teachers 48

TABLE 5: Analysis of Variance of Total Questionnaire Score for Regular and Special Education Teachers 49

TABLE 6: Analysis of Variance of Total Questionnaire Score for Male and Female Teachers 49

TABLE 7: Analysis of Variance of Total Questionnaire Score for Male and Female Regular Education Teachers 50

TABLE 8: Analysis of Variance of Total Questionnaire Score for Male and Female Special Education Teachers 50

TABLE 9: Intercorrelations Between Age, Total Years Teaching, Total Years Teaching in Current Position, Total Years Teaching Students with EBD, Total Questionnaire Score 52

Chapter I

Introduction

The behaviours of children and adolescents with emotional and behavioural disorders (EBD) present significant challenges to educators (Arrlen, Gable, & Hendrickson, 1994; Guetzloe, 1992; Hollinger, 1987; Knapczyk, 1992; McLeer, Pain, & Johnson, 1993; Muscott, 1996; Quinn, Jannasch-Pennell, & Rutherford, Jr., 1995a). Professionals are often not equipped with sufficient knowledge regarding EBD and have neither the adequate nor appropriate strategies required for managing such behaviours. Children identified as behaviourally disordered represent approximately 9.6% of all children receiving special education services (Bauer & Shea, 1999), are frequently ranked among the group of students most difficult to teach (Gresham, MacMillan, & Bocian, 1996), and are typically at higher risk for developing problems in adulthood (Coleman, Pfeiffer, & Oakland, 1992; Gresham et al., 1996; Griffin, 1987; Quinn, Mathur, & Rutherford, Jr., 1995b; Walker, Shinn, O'Neill, & Ramsey, 1987). The development of educational programming focusing on the behavioural needs of students with EBD is a concern within the field of education (Griffin).

To appropriately intervene to change the disruptive behaviours of these students, a definition of EBD must be operationalized. A standardized definition of EBD assists professionals to better understand behaviour disorders, and aids in the appropriate identification of such children. Within society, the majority of individuals will display behaviour consistent with normative standards. Yet, by the time many children with EBD enter the school system, they have already learned inappropriate and disruptive behaviours (Quinn et al., 1995a) and continue to exhibit such "excessive and/or chronic behaviours" (Bullock, Zagar, Donahue, & Pelton, 1985, p. 124) within the school system.

A defining characteristic among students with EBD is the tendency to exhibit aggression (Etscheidt, 1991; Wehby, 1994; Wehby, Symons, & Shores, 1995), which is on the rise in schools (Myles & Simpson, 1994a, 1994b). Aggression, viewed as an externalizing behaviour, can take

many forms and can also vary in frequency, duration, and intensity. Such behaviours commonly include "fighting, temper tantrums, destroying property, and defying or threatening others" (Walker et al., 1987, p. 7). Aggression also includes both physical and verbal aggression and other disruptive behaviours such as "impulsiveness, hyperactivity, disobedience, poor peer relations, delinquency, lying, and negativism" (Arllen et al., 1994, p. 19). The presentation of aggressive behaviour makes it difficult for children with EBD to experience success within the school setting.

For the purposes of the present study, an EBD is defined as a pattern of externalizing behaviours in opposition to the behaviours expected of students at school. Deviation from shared expectations suggests the inability for students with EBD to both competently meet the demands of their classroom environment and to appropriately control their behaviours and feelings under normal circumstances and conditions (Bauer & Shea, 1999). The resulting effects of such behaviours lead to further difficulties for students with EBD.

These students exhibit the highest dropout rate of any disability group (Bauer & Shea, 1999) and often exhibit learning difficulties (Duncan, Forness, & Hartsough, 1995). In addition, many students with EBD do not possess the social and emotional skills required to cope at school and within society (Bassett et al., 1996). A characteristic common to students with EBD is their lack of ability to maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with both peers and adults, at home, school, and in the community (Duncan et al., 1995; see also Gresham et al., 1996). It is evident that these students require education and skill development focused on their unique learning and emotional needs, in an educational environment conducive to success.

Despite recommendations cited under The Regular Education Initiative (REI), which advocates for educational objectives and interventions to be provided within the regular classroom to the greatest extent possible (Cheney & Harvey, 1994), students with EBD represent the group of pupils most commonly educated in segregated educational settings (Muscott, 1996). Research has labeled the integration of students with EBD as the "last frontier of inclusion"

(Muscott, p. 301), despite initiatives and policy changes centered on inclusive education and the maintenance of these students within the least restrictive environment (Rock, Rosenberg, & Carran, 1995).

The integration and inclusion of students with EBD poses various challenges for teachers and schools. The education of students identified as EBD is a difficult process, with current literature indicating that the integration of these students into less restrictive environments, which includes the general education classroom, is one of the "greatest challenges within the inclusion movement" (Cartledge & Johnson, 1996, p. 52). Students with EBD are considered the most difficult to mainstream into less structured and less specialized settings, in part due to their noted difficulties meeting the behavioural expectations of such a classroom environment (Cartledge & Johnson). As a result, these students are served within segregated settings and fewer than 10% are likely to be reintegrated into a regular program once placed in a special education program (Muscott, 1995).

To promote the inclusion of all students, in the spirit of equity, placement within integrated classrooms is desirable. EBD students in mainstream settings have higher academic achievement and also display better work habits, study habits, study skills, and higher grades than students with EBD in segregated settings (Meadows, Neel, Scott, & Parker, 1994). In regards to behaviour, students in non-mainstreamed settings display more disruptive behaviours, score lower on scales of adaptive functioning, and are more likely to exhibit variations in mood (Meadows et al.).

In order to achieve responsible integration, based on the notion of appropriate fit between the student and the educational environment to which they are entering, the demands of the receiving teacher should be taken into account (Wong, Kauffman, & Lloyd, 1993). It thus becomes the responsibility of the teacher within the setting where the student is currently being taught and of the receiving teacher to coordinate discussion centered on what specific standards for behaviour students must meet. To increase the academic and emotional/behavioural success

of students with EBD, an appropriate match between the teacher and student should be attained (Mick, 1993), which "must not be left to chance" (Wong, Kauffman, & Lloyd, 1991).

Careful selection of teachers and educational environments is not possible without first determining whether the competencies of the student and the standards of the specific teacher are in accordance. In order to achieve this, the standards which teachers hold for the performance of their students must be identified. Without such identification, responsible and successful integration cannot be achieved. In addition, the expectancies teachers hold for the academic performance and social and behavioural competence of students with EBD is indicated to be a powerful factor in the educational outcomes of such students (Walker & Lamon, 1987).

Muscott (1996) conducted a comparative study designed to assess teacher standards for the behaviour of students with EBD between different settings, by instructional level. The results showed higher standards for behaviour in less restrictive settings. Muscott highlighted the utility of identifying teacher standards for behaviour to assist students to achieve success within their classroom setting. The present study was a partial replication of the study completed by Muscott, within the Canadian context. Elementary teachers within either a regular education or specialized behaviour classroom were surveyed to determine their standards for the behaviour of students with EBD. The Classroom Participation Scale: Teacher Standards Instrument (CPS: TSI), developed by Tannenbaum and Muscott (1986) was utilized.

The purpose of the study was to determine whether teacher standards for the behaviour of students with EBD differed by educational setting. The results of the study have implications for the successful integration of students with EBD into less restrictive environments.

Part two of this paper discusses the relevant literature regarding the characteristics of students with EBD and a discussion of the definition of EBD, the integration of students with EBD, and an overview of the factors which both predict integration and relate to the success of integration. Part three discusses the procedures used to address the research questions. Part four describes the results of the questionnaire and part five discusses the results and conclusions drawn

from the research.

Chapter II

Literature Review

This section discusses the characteristics of students with EBD and their inclusion into less restrictive educational settings. The primary focus is on the integration of students with EBD and the factors, which affect the success of integration. Factors related to the decision to integrate students with EBD are also discussed. Research questions based on the review of the literature follow.

Students with EBD represent approximately 9.6% of all children receiving special education services (Bauer & Shea, 1999), yet fewer than 10% of children with EBD are likely to be reintegrated into mainstream classroom settings once placed in special education classrooms (Muscott, 1995). These students present challenges to teachers and schools, due to such behaviours as aggression (Etscheidt, 1991; Wehby, 1994; Wehby et al., 1995) and learning difficulties (Duncan et al., 1995). The education of students with EBD continues to be a concern within the field of education (Griffin, 1987).

Standardized Definition of EBD

When reviewing current literature focusing on students with EBD, it is often difficult to compare groups of students, as subjects are often inadequately described (Schneider & Leroux, 1994). The terms, which describe emotional and behavioural disorders, are used in a variety of ways, making it difficult to define an EBD student. To appropriately intervene to change the behaviours of these students, a definition of EBD must be standardized.

Students with EBD exhibit behaviours which oppose commonly held expectations for appropriate behaviour. A defining characteristic of students with EBD is the tendency to exhibit externalizing behaviours, such as aggression (Etscheidt, 1991; Wehby, 1994; Wehby et al., 1995). These behaviours challenge the safety of teachers and schools and make it difficult for students with EBD to learn and to function successfully within the school setting (Quinn et al., 1995a).

As previously stated, for the purposes of the present study, an EBD is defined as a pattern

of externalizing behaviour in opposition to the behaviours expected of students at school. These students typically exhibit a number of observable maladaptive behaviours, which include

(a) an inability to establish or maintain satisfactory relationships with peers or adults,

(b) a general mood of unhappiness or depression,

(c) inappropriate behaviour or feelings under ordinary conditions,

(d) continued difficulty in coping with the learning situation in spite of remedial intervention,

(e) physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems,

(f) difficulties in accepting the realities of personal responsibility and accountability, and

(g) physical violence toward other persons and/or physical destructiveness toward the environment (Alberta Education, p. 23-24).

The learning, emotional, and behavioural development of students with EBD is therefore affected by the presentation of such behaviours.

Characteristics of Students with EBD

More male students are identified as EBD, with a higher ratio of male to female students both identified and served in the school system (Bauer & Shea, 1999; Del'Homme, Kasari, Forness, & Bagley, 1996; Dixon-Floyd & Johnson, 1997; Duncan et al., 1995). These students have the highest dropout rate of any disability group and fewer than 50% are likely to graduate from high school (Bauer & Shea). Furthermore, students with EBD have the highest rates of absenteeism, suspension, and expulsion among students with disabilities (Bauer & Shea). Additional studies have demonstrated that students with behaviour problems and those with primary behavioural and secondary academic difficulties, have significantly higher rates of familial discord (Del'Homme et al., 1996). Duncan et al. also showed that a commonly shared characteristic among children with EBD is the divorce of their parents. It would appear that the presentation of disruptive behaviours affects the success of EBD students at school.

When reviewing referral rates for children referred for special education services,

Del'Homme et al. (1996) found that the overall percentage of students referred due to behavioural concerns was lower than for students referred due to the presentation of academic difficulties. It has been indicated that a majority of students who were eventually labeled EBD were initially considered learning disabled (Del'Homme et al.). Therefore, students displaying maladaptive patterns of behaviour may be misidentified and subsequently may or may not qualify for special education services.

Hutton (1985) contrasted this view, by suggesting that the majority of students referred by their regular classroom teachers, for special education services, was a function of behavioural concerns, not academic difficulties. Hutton also indicated that a primary reason students with EBD were referred, was due to "poor peer relations" (p. 80). Further studies have shown that children who exhibit externalizing behaviours, including aggression and disruptiveness, were more likely to be referred and placed within a segregated program, as opposed to their peers who display internalizing behaviours such as anxiety, depression, and withdrawal (Hendrickson, Smith, & Frank, 1998). From the research presented, it would appear that students with EBD exhibiting overt, disruptive behaviours are more likely to receive special education services.

Of particular interest is current literature indicating that students with EBD often have comorbid language disorders and poor listening skills, which may hinder successful social interaction and predict further behavioural problems in later years (Warr-Leeper, Wright, & Mack, 1994; see also Bauer & Shea, 1999). The language difficulties of students with EBD are further compounded by their social skills deficits, in addition to the disruptive behaviours these students commonly display. Furthermore, these students experience difficulty in terms of adaptive adult development and adjustment, which includes "increased risk for divorce, alcohol and drug abuse, and higher rates of crime and subsequent incarceration" (Gresham et al., 1996, p. 278). Without early identification, appropriate diagnosis, and adequate intervention, it is evident that these students are subject to developing an array of maladaptive behaviours.

In terms of ability functioning and academic achievement, students with EBD often

exhibit learning difficulties. A study completed by Duncan et al. (1995) found that, of the 85 students in their study, the average full-scale intelligence quotient (IQ) was in the average range, although achievement scores in the areas of reading, mathematics, and written language were all within the low average range. It is evident that these students require education and skill development catered to their unique learning and emotional needs, in an educational environment conducive to success.

Educational Settings for Students with EBD

Students with EBD are commonly educated in segregated educational settings (Muscott, 1996), despite recommendations which advocate for the education of students with special needs to be provided within the regular classroom as much as possible (Cheney & Harvey, 1994). The integration of students with EBD is a challenge for teachers and schools, with current literature suggesting that the movement of EBD students into less restrictive environments, is one of the "greatest challenges within the inclusion movement" (Cartledge & Johnson, 1996, p. 52).

In order to facilitate the unique learning needs of each individual student, a cascade, or continuum of services is necessary (Winzer, 1996). The cascade model which educators commonly refer to is 'Deno's Cascade', which is a diagrammatic model outlining the educational settings in which students with special needs are placed. The pictorial representation of this model resembles an inverted pyramid, moving from more restrictive educational environments at the base, or point, of the pyramid, where fewer students are served, to less restrictive educational environments at the top, where more students are served (Winzer).

Within the cascade of services, the regular classroom represents the environment, which provides children with EBD the opportunity for maximum integration with their same-age, non-handicapped peers (Winzer, 1996). The regular classroom is the placement option most commonly thought of when the terms inclusion and integration are utilized, and is the educational environment many educators aspire to have students served in. Students within the general classroom may have additional supports directly provided in the classroom, or may receive

remediation in the form of a pullout program or resource room. Movement throughout the cascade of services, outside of the regular classroom setting is considered to be more restrictive.

Dependent upon the needs of the individual child, a student may be placed in a special education classroom, either on a part-time or full-time basis (Winzer, 1996). Students may also be placed outside of their neighbourhood schools, in special day programs equipped to meet the unique learning needs of children with EBD. Beyond this service option is the residential school, which removes a student with EBD from their home and community and educates children with similar needs together (Winzer). The most restrictive educational environment is considered to be homebound and hospital instruction, as children are not provided much opportunity to engage in social interaction with their peers.

The integration of students with EBD into less restrictive educational settings has been met with confusion and apprehension. The confusion surrounding the education of students with EBD is primarily due to the terminology used, as misinterpretations of such terms as inclusion, integration, and least restrictive environment are present (Roberts & Mather, 1995). The term inclusion, which refers to the total education of all students with disabilities within the regular education classroom, has come to mean different things to different people (Roberts & Mather). Essentially, inclusion entails the education of all students within the same environment, regardless of the nature and severity of their disability. Furthermore, inclusion stresses the importance of promoting the acceptance of students with special needs, including those with EBD, among their non-disabled peers. Finally, the terms mainstreaming and integration are used together (Winzer, 1996) to refer to the "physical, intellectual, social, and emotional integration of exceptional children and youth into the regular educational milieu" (p. 70).

The impetus for inclusion has stemmed from dissatisfaction regarding the dual system of education which currently functions in our schools (Stainback & Stainback, 1996). It has been suggested that maintaining both a regular education and special education program is "inefficient" (Stainback & Stainback, p. 45), as it separates teachers, funding, instruction, and

management of students into two systems of education. Merging the two systems into a unified educational system where all students are served in the same classroom environment, is purported to be advantageous to meeting the instructional and individual needs of all students and to coordinating the services of school personnel (Stainback & Stainback).

The term least restrictive environment (LRE) stems from the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142), which was passed in the United States of America (USA) in 1975 (Muscott, 1995; Roberts & Mather, 1995). Although this law is not representative of the specific laws utilized in regards to the education of children with special needs in Canada, much of Canadian special education reform has stemmed from developments in the USA (Gartner & Lipsky, 1996), so therefore the topic is discussed here. The concept of the LRE pertains to the full-time placement of a student with special needs in an environment as close to the general classroom as possible (Bunch, 1994), based upon the unique needs of the student. The LRE requires the provision of a "full continuum of alternative placements" (Roberts & Mather, p. 47), which resembles the cascade of service alternatives described within Deno's Cascade (Winzer, 1995). Ultimately, the challenge is to educate students with EBD within the least restrictive of educational environments, a decision based upon their instructional, social, and behavioural needs.

The notion of the least restrictive environment is conceptualized differently by separate groups of educational professionals and may be considered partially responsible for the differential placement of students with EBD. One perspective maintains that the least restrictive environment represents the educational setting where the students' instructional, emotional, psychosocial, and individual needs are most likely to be met (Cheney & Harvey, 1994). Within this model, it is acknowledged that a variety of educational settings and placement options must be maintained in order to meet educational and social needs of students with disabilities (Muscott, 1996). It is presumed that the educational goals and objectives of students with EBD will best be met by providing a continuum of placement options, catered to their individual needs.

From another perspective, advocates of inclusion would argue that the least restrictive environment "should always be the regular classroom" (Cheney & Harvey, 1994, p. 333). Supporters of full inclusion do not support the separation of students into two separate classrooms, which currently functions in our schools (Cheney & Harvey). An inclusive model encourages the implementation of a comprehensive system of supports within general education settings, designed to meet student needs.

These two perspectives are in direct opposition concerning the most appropriate placement option for students with EBD. Several barriers exist which prevent the full inclusion of these students within general education settings. Successful inclusion has been limited due to lack of adequate resources, resistant teacher attitudes, lack of appropriate teacher training and scholarship, limited opportunity for supervision, and limits and changes inherent within the curriculum (Muscott, 1996).

Some researchers have recommended that professionals must assist students with EBD to obtain access to the educational setting where their instructional and emotional needs will be most appropriately met (Cheney & Harvey, 1994). Maintaining a cascade of service options, including both general and special education settings is thus warranted to adequately address the individual needs of each student with EBD (Muscott, 1997). Yet, in part due to the aforementioned barriers, which include the behaviours of students with EBD, integration into inclusive educational settings is limited. Research has labeled the integration of students with EBD as the "last frontier of inclusion" (Muscott, 1996, p. 301), despite initiatives and policy changes centered on the notion of inclusive education and the maintenance of these students within the least restrictive environment (Rock, Rosenberg, & Carran, 1995).

Challenges to Integration

Educators advocating for the maintenance of a range of service options for students with EBD suggest that the general education classroom is not effective in meeting the needs of all EBD students. They maintain that special classes provide a smaller and safer environment, which

afford greater flexibility in meeting the educational and emotional needs of students with EBD (Hallenback & Kauffman, 1996).

To envision the implementation of a unified system of education, where students with EBD are served in the regular education classroom, it is imperative that the very people responsible for the delivery of such a program are considered, i. e., the teachers. Teacher attitudes towards the integration of students with EBD play a large role in the success of integration. Resistance to integration may be a result of feelings of isolation (Lupart & Webber, 1996) and lack of input into decision-making (Vaughn, Schumm, Jallad, Slusher, & Saumell, 1996).

Vaughn et al. (1996) conducted focus groups with teachers to ascertain their views and opinions of inclusion. The majority of the comments did not suggest a positive view of inclusion, as the teachers felt that they did not have sufficient input regarding the implementation of inclusive classrooms (Vaughn et al.).. Many of the teachers indicated that inclusion is often encouraged by individuals who neither understand it nor comprehend the obstacles to its successful start (Vaughn et al.). Lupart & Webber (1996) further discuss resistance to inclusion based on the notion of lack of teacher input and decision making power.

Furthermore, it has been suggested that many general education teachers lack the necessary skills and experience to fulfill the demands of educating children with EBD (Cartledge & Johnson, 1996; Hallenback & Kauffman, 1996). Teachers require specialized skills to provide educational programming for students with EBD. Such skills include adequate knowledge of behaviour management techniques and the ability to appropriately apply them, appropriate implementation of reinforcement systems and reward, experience adapting the curriculum to facilitate academic development, and the ability to work with other educators to coordinate services (Hallenback & Kauffman; see also Cartledge & Johnson).

In addition, general education teachers are typically viewed as being less tolerant of the behaviours displayed by students with EBD and are seen as interpreting their behaviours in a

more negative manner (Cartledge & Johnson, 1996). Current literature has also shown that general education teachers have higher demands for behaviour (Kauffman & Wong, 1991; Ritter, 1989). It has been indicated that students with EBD are most often rejected out of any disability category (Muscott, 1995) and that teachers within the mainstream setting are "neither interested nor prepared" (p. 371) to meet the needs of students with EBD.

Negative attitudes towards the education of students with EBD may contribute to the reluctance on the part of educators to have these children placed within their classrooms and within less restrictive educational settings. It has been suggested that teacher attitudes may be related to the type of disability a student presents, as teachers have been found to hold more negative attitudes regarding the integration of students with academic and behaviour problems (Soodak, Podell, & Lehman, 1998). Support for integration is also typically dependent upon the degree and intensity of the behaviours displayed (Soodak et al., 1998; Ward & Le Dean, 1996). It is evident that teacher attitudes play an important role in the education of students with EBD.

Teachers who believe that they are capable of working with students with EBD and who perceive that they are able to 'make a difference', are often more accepting of students who display disruptive behaviours (Jackson, 1995). Self-efficacy, the belief in one's ability to competently perform a task (Kauffman & Wong, 1991), typically increases with training and successful classroom experiences. Furthermore, teachers who have a high degree of self-efficacy tend to recommend the regular classroom more often, and are more likely to take responsibility for the education of students with EBD within their classrooms (Soodak et al., 1998). Without a change in teacher attitudes, the successful integration of students with EBD will continue to be a challenge within the inclusion movement.

Another challenge to the integration of students with EBD is lack of parental support (Jackson, 1995). Parents are instrumental in assisting their children to learn appropriate behaviour. Furthermore, parents are in a position to reinforce the efforts of the school in teaching acceptable behaviours. Students who do not receive support from home may not have the

opportunity to use newly learned behaviours, which may lead to further difficulties and prevent movement into mainstreamed settings. In addition, it has been noted that many parents of non-handicapped children would prefer children with EBD to be educated in separate settings (Muscott, 1995), to maintain adequate service delivery to their non-handicapped children. From the preceding discussion, it is evident that there exist several obstacles to the successful integration of students with EBD.

Successful Integration

To facilitate the successful integration of students with EBD, it has been indicated that we should consider our expectations of the receiving teacher. Jackson (1995) drew attention to the "reasonableness, fairness, and practicality of the demands upon the teacher" (p. 122). Critical to the education of any student is the preparedness of teachers to meet the needs of their students. In the case of students with EBD, placing them in an environment, which does not meet their needs, will inevitably lead to failure. Therefore, teachers accepting children with EBD into their classrooms should demonstrate adequate knowledge and expertise in interacting with and instructing such students.

The instructional methods teachers utilize within their classrooms can support the successful integration of students with EBD. Teachers who use practices geared towards the instructional needs of each child, as opposed to one method for all, experience greater success with exceptional students (Soodak et al., 1998). The types of modifications teachers utilize for students with EBD has been cited as a major factor contributing to their success within the regular education classroom. Modifications to instructional methods, the curriculum, and behaviour management techniques are therefore required to facilitate the integration of these students.

In addition, the integration of children with EBD must consider the expectancies of the receiving environment (Jackson, 1995). Students should demonstrate appropriate mastery of both the academic and social skills necessary for success in a less restrictive environment (Hallenback & Kauffman, 1996). Without communication between teachers, adequate skill development

cannot be achieved. Instruction focused on alternative, more appropriate behaviours may promote success within integrated educational settings.

It has been suggested that schools and school districts where principals and administrators provide support and consultation for teachers determine the type of attitudes teachers hold towards including students with special needs (Soodak et al., 1998). Creating a supportive working environment, which encourages the input and opinions of its teachers, appears to lend itself to a greater degree of positive regard towards integration. A school's view of integration may be aided by the philosophies of its principal (Shriner, Ysseldyke, Thurlow, & Honetschlager, 1994), who not only advocates for the inclusion of students with various disabilities, but also provides support for their staff.

To support the integration of students with EBD, a change in regards to the attitudes and philosophy of integration of these children must be developed. Muscott (1995) highlighted a four-step process to support the inclusion of students with EBD. The first step recommends the development of a supportive "vision" (Muscott, p. 373) of inclusion. In this process, the negative and stereotyped attitudes educators hold must be approached, challenged, and ultimately reshaped into more positive belief systems (Muscott). Critical to this process is the identification of the standards and expectations teachers hold for the behaviour of these students. Developing a mission statement, which advocates for the inclusion of students with EBD into appropriate educational environments, is a necessary first step.

The second step Muscott (1995) suggested is the "design of schoolwide components that support inclusion" (p. 374), which includes well-trained staff that have a repertoire of skills, a team approach, strong leadership, and parental involvement. Active staff involvement in decision-making is required, as is supportive principals and administrators. The third step is to provide effective instruction to support inclusion, which includes social skills training, curriculum modification and instructional accommodations, teaching to assist in the transfer of skills between settings and across people, and individual behaviour plans, which stress expectations for

behaviour (Muscott). Without instruction geared to the unique learning needs of students with EBD, they will not have the opportunity to learn and develop a wider array of social and interpersonal skills. The final step is to evaluate the process and to implement change where it is required (Muscott). To envision integration as a viable alternative for the education of students with EBD, it is evident that a host of factors must be considered. A primary question that educators may ask, is why should less restrictive educational settings be considered as an option for students with EBD?

Why Integrate?

Meadows et al. (1994) conducted a study to compare the academic achievement and social competencies of students with EBD in both mainstream and nonmainstream settings. Their research indicated that students with EBD in mainstream settings performed better on tests of academic achievement, than did their counterparts with EBD in nonmainstreamed settings. Students with EBD in the general education classroom also displayed better work habits, study skills, and higher grades (Meadows et al.). In regards to behaviour, students with EBD in nonmainstreamed settings displayed more disruptive and withdrawn patterns of behaviour (Meadows et al.). Students with EBD in segregated settings demonstrated lower scores on scales of adaptive functioning, appropriate behaviour, and were more likely to display variations in mood. The results of this study are further supported by other findings, which indicate that students in self-contained classrooms have greater difficulty in terms of academic performance, ability to engage in self-control, and problems with interpersonal relations and social skill development (Bassett et al., 1996).

In addition, studies have documented that students without disabilities have not been adversely affected by the placement of students with disabilities within their classrooms. Sharpe, York, and Knight (1994) conducted a comparative study to determine whether non-disordered students taught within an inclusive classroom would display differences in academic performance, than those taught within non-inclusive settings. The results did not show evidence

of differences between the two groups in any of the academic areas.

Integration of Students with EBD

Current literature has shown that two sets of factors are related to the integration of students with EBD, where integration is considered to be any movement into a less restrictive educational setting (Rock et al., 1995). First of all, factors are present which affect the success of integration. Secondly, factors are present which promote the decision to integrate students with EBD.

First of all, it will be beneficial to discuss the factors related to the successful integration of students with EBD into general education settings. Identifying the factors contributing to successful integration will ultimately assist students with EBD to attain desired educational outcomes. Secondly, due to continued resistance to a single educational system (Cheney & Harvey, 1994), it is of interest to discuss the variables which both restrict and predict access to more inclusive educational settings for students with EBD. Identifying the specific factors that influence the decision to integrate a child with an EBD will help to increase the likelihood of integration (Rock et al., 1995).

Identifying variables related to the rate, at which students with EBD are integrated, in addition to the factors, which aid in successful integration, will help to ensure that appropriate educational and behavioural programming is implemented and that the key variables influencing integration are put in place. For the purposes of the present study, the factors related to the success of integration will be the primary focus.

Factors related to the decision to integrate.

It has been suggested that integration has been limited for students with EBD as little research has been conducted on the factors which promote the integration of students with EBD (Rock et al., 1995). Most studies centered on students with EBD focus on the specific characteristics of either the receiving teacher or on the behavior of the student when determining placement within an inclusive setting. It is of interest to discuss the factors which affect the rate

at which students with EBD are integrated into less restrictive settings. By identifying these factors, professionals and local school districts can jointly plan to implement practices aimed at integration, which will in turn, also promote its success.

Rock et al. (1995) completed a non-experimental study that examined both program and teacher variables, to determine the specific factors which predicted the placement of students with EBD into less restrictive educational settings. The study focused on the special education teacher and the special education program from which students would be integrated. Rock et al. suggested that little research has been completed on the role of the special education teacher in the process of integration. This phenomenon was viewed as surprising, since the special education teacher is typically responsible for assessing student readiness for referral and transfer to a new educational setting, preparing students for learning and interaction within a different environment, and planning for reintegration (Rock et al.). The authors thus attempted to identify the effect of certain special education teacher variables on the integration rate of students with EBD.

Secondly, the study was conducted to determine whether a school's overall mission and attitude (Rock et al., 1995) would be related to the rate of integration of students with EBD. Prior research has demonstrated that a school's philosophy toward integration may be a strong influencing factor contributing to the likelihood of integration (Rock et al.; Muscott, 1995), even beyond an individual teacher's abilities to successfully integrate students. School wide programming goals which stress the efficacy of alternative placement options, with an emphasis on integration into less restrictive environments, will ultimately help to foster the inclusion and integration of students with EBD. Programs that strive to establish procedures for integration and that support placement in least restrictive environments, once students with EBD demonstrate readiness, will ultimately promote integration as an option. As a result, students with EBD will not continue to be isolated in segregated settings.

Rock et al. (1995) attempted to evaluate the effects of four independent variables on the

rate of integration of students with serious emotional disturbance into less restrictive educational settings, which included program orientation and teacher attitudes and experience. This research objective was accomplished by surveying teachers who rated the contribution of the aforementioned factors on the integration rate of these students. Both the independent and dependent variables were well defined and the utilization of the independent variables was well supported by the research literature. The literature review section was thorough, as it critically reviewed previous research findings and identified areas where little research had been completed. The gaps identified in prior research studies were the areas Rock et al. attempted to study.

To assess the contribution of the independent variables on the integration rate of students with EBD, Rock et al. (1995) developed a 66-item survey questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed and validated through a pilot study conducted on a panel of 25 experts chosen for their unique experiences within the field of integration (Rock et al.). The recommendations generated by the experts were integrated into the development of the final survey instrument.

Appropriate statistical analyses were completed on the survey data and the data were coded and analyzed with SPSSx statistical software (Rock et al., 1995). The panel of experts also ranked the independent variables in terms of which factors were important to integration planning and decision-making, which was further confirmed by additional research findings. These ranked factors were then entered into a multiple regression analysis, to determine the predictive utility of the four independent variables on the criterion rate of integration (Rock et al.).

Teachers from 31 schools serving students with EBD were asked to participate in the study. It was difficult to determine whether these teachers were representative of all teachers serving students with serious emotional disturbance, as an adequate description of the teachers who made up the sample was not provided. The questionnaires were distributed to 162 teachers across 31 schools. This number yielded a low number of potential teachers per school who could have responded.

The return rate of 73% indicated that approximately 118 teachers returned the questionnaires. Therefore, approximately three to four teachers from each school responded. The potential that one school may have had more, or less, than three or four teachers per school who completed the survey, was not discussed. Unequal proportionate representation from each school could have potentially biased the results and the scores could have thus been artificially inflated or deflated.

Although the questionnaire was field tested on a panel of experts, the survey instrument was not piloted on a representative sample of teachers. Teachers serving students with serious emotional disturbance may have interpreted the contribution of the independent variables differently than the panel of experts. Had a pilot study been completed on the teachers, some of the criticisms outlined above could have been deleted or at least anticipated.

Teachers from 31 schools from four counties in Maryland were surveyed, although the number of teachers who could have received the questionnaire was not noted. It was difficult to ascertain whether this sample was a random, representative sample of all teachers serving students with EBD across the four counties. Descriptive statistical information was not provided on the teachers, which further limited both the population and ecological validity of the sample. Actual rate of participation within each respective county was very low, ranging from 12% to 39% of the total sample (Rock et al.). There was also no mention of a follow-up to increase the return rate within each county. As previously stated, the results could have therefore been artificially inflated or deflated.

It was not specified how the teachers were identified, and Rock et al. (1995) did not discuss whether an ethics clearance form accompanied the questionnaires. On a final note, Rock et al. did not acknowledge whether the teachers who responded to the study were different from those who did not respond. Nonrespondents may have been reluctant to put forward their views. It would be of interest to interview those teachers who did not respond, to determine their opinions and perceptions about the factors influencing the rate of integration.

The teachers were asked to rate the contribution of 66 items, to assess the influence of the four independent variables on the rate of integration of students with EBD (Rock et al., 1995). Some items were rated on a five-point Likert-type scale, and others were selected from a series of close-ended response questions. Rock et al. did not specify how many items were assessed by each of the two methods. The instrument was not clearly described, although examples of each variable surveyed in the questionnaire were provided. Despite this, it was difficult to decipher what each example meant, as the examples were presented in a chart format with several abbreviations. Reliability and validity information was provided.

The results of the study showed that program integration orientation, program demographic information, and teacher's experience and training accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in the integration rate of students with EBD (Rock et al., 1995). In particular, those programs espousing a positive philosophy and attitude towards the integration of pupils with EBD, exhibited an overall higher rate of integration (Rock et al.). Policies that provided special education teachers the opportunity select an appropriate classroom setting for integration of the student also improved the likelihood that students would be integrated (Rock et al.).

Philosophies providing opportunities for teachers to be involved in the integration process will inevitably increase the probability that students with EBD will be integrated. Providing special education teachers with decision-making power may serve to further placement in less restrictive settings, as the teachers will perceive that they have a role and a say in what occurs within their classrooms. As a result, resistance to integration of students with EBD may decrease.

In terms of program demographics, schools that had programs located in " (a) a comprehensive school wing as compared to a special facility, (b) had proximity to the reintegration site, and (c) had a public program within certain counties" (Rock et al., 1995, p. 264) appeared to have higher rates of integration. Programs located in the wings of public

schools and those in close proximity to the integration site probably enabled integration by providing easy access and options to less restrictive educational settings. Finally, teachers with more experience and training integrated more students (Rock et al.). This was probably because these teachers were equipped with appropriate strategies and intervention techniques for dealing with students with EBD and felt more competent at integrating these children into their classrooms. It is also possible that the students may have been taught a wider array of prosocial, behavioral, and academic skills, to aid their success within a new educational environment. It is evident from this research that certain policy changes must be undertaken to promote the rate at which children with EBD are integrated into less restrictive environments.

Related to Rock et al. (1995), Myles and Simpson (1992) attempted to demonstrate that willingness to integrate may be dependent on whether general education teachers have input into the integration decision, or whether they perceived the notion of mainstreaming to be forced upon them. The subjects were 281 general education teachers employed in a public school district. All teachers were asked to participate in the study, although the return rate was only 51%. This indicated that approximately 10 teachers from each of the 19 schools were surveyed. Myles and Simpson did not provide evidence of a follow-up, which could have increased the return rate.

The authors did not indicate how the teachers were asked to participate in the study and it was not evident whether the participants volunteered or were coerced into participating. Descriptive statistical information was provided, although with a response rate of only 51%, it was difficult to ascertain whether these specific teachers were representative of all general education teachers. As a result, the population validity was limited.

Myles and Simpson (1992) described the settings in which the teachers were employed, although the settings may have been biased as 95.8% of the residents, within the areas served by the schools, were Caucasian (p. 306). Therefore, these areas may not have been representative of other suburban public school districts. As a result, the ecological validity of this study was lacking, as the results of the teacher rated surveys could only be generalized to environmental

settings with a similar representation of individuals.

In addition, Myles and Simpson (1992) did not provide evidence of differences between respondents and nonrespondents. Those who responded to the survey may have been interested in the study and may have had a personal stake in the results. Those who did not respond may have actually been the population of interest. Nonrespondents may have been hesitant to relay their views, although their perceptions regarding effective modifications and decision-making power may have had importance for the study.

The surveys included the use of vignettes to ensure construct validity and to provide an operational definition of the characteristics, which led to a diagnosis of an EBD. Myles and Simpson (1992) did not suggest whether the vignettes were based on expertise in the area of students with EBD, or whether their construction was based on research literature, although the vignettes were field tested, to seek validity for their content and clarity. Reliability and validity information was provided.

A cover letter was enclosed with the survey materials, which presumably outlined ethical issues related to research experiments. Myles and Simpson (1992) used appropriate statistical analyses to generate their results. Despite this, the results may have had limited generalizability due to the use of vignettes. The vignettes may not have adequately portrayed the students that the teachers in these school districts were actually involved with. As a result, the results would lack adequate generalizability, unless the students were of the same academic and behavioural characteristics highlighted in the vignettes.

Finally, improper sampling techniques were used, as the sample did not represent a proportionate representation of school districts. The teachers were "drawn from a single district consisting of largely white, middle-class citizens" (Myles & Simpson, 1992, p. 314). As a result, the attitudes and opinions regarding mainstreaming and the utility of having decision-making abilities may have been biased in favor of the opinions of the particular school district.

It appeared as though integration was related to the provision of types and amount of

professional support (Myles & Simpson, 1992). The ability to select modification strategies may have altered teachers' perceptions of integration. The results of the study showed that teachers prefer, at least at a minimum level, certain modifications, which include support services and consultation with both professionals and special education teachers (Myles & Simpson). It appeared that the quality of supports was more important than quantity, as the surveyed teachers reported a preference for a smaller number of services than was available (Myles & Simpson). In addition, teachers reported a desire for smaller class sizes and more planning time to enable them to better meet the individualized academic and behavioral needs of children with EBD.

In terms of decision-making ability, "75% of the teachers" (Myles & Simpson, 1992, p. 311) reported a preference for sharing in decision-making, as opposed to forced modifications and integration. Providing teachers with opportunities to have a voice in their classroom environment most likely enables teachers to make informed decisions regarding the integration of students with EBD, and may serve to further increase their general acceptance of integration.

Professionals and educators might logically assume that the actual overt manifestation of maladaptive behaviours of children with EBD would be an influencing factor in any placement decision (Rock et al., 1995). Research completed by Glassberg (1994) has documented that unique student characteristics do not appear to be primary factors in the outcome of placement within a student's respective educational setting. From the research conducted by Glassberg, it appeared that placement options for EBD students were based on such factors as subjective teacher ratings and on space availability within a less restrictive setting, as opposed to the actual and current level of functioning of the student. It was also indicated that placement outcomes are often related to such variables as the size, economy, and attitudes of the area in which the school serves (Glassberg). Although it is evident that student characteristics do not comprise the sole factors contributing to the decision to place a student, their relative influence should not be overlooked.

Glassberg (1994) conducted a retrospective case study review to determine the

characteristics, which differentiate between types of students with EBD and thus relate to placement in integrated educational settings. Glassberg identified the target population with precise guidelines, and sampled 252 students from this population utilizing a criterion-sampling technique. Descriptive statistical information concerning the racial makeup of the sample was presented, which was approximately equally represented by whites and nonwhites. The racial makeup of the group was 56.3% white and 47.3% nonwhite (Glassberg). Despite this, blacks were overrepresented as they composed 97% of the nonwhite group. This could have been a potential bias, thus limiting the generalizability of the results.

In addition, the males in the sample were disproportionately represented, which also reflected a sampling bias. Glassberg (1994) provided age ranges and IQ scores where available. The provision of this information helps readers to make comparisons and also serves to ensure appropriate population validity. Due to the two sampling biases contained within the sampling procedures, adequate generalizability to other populations may be limited, thus restricting population validity. Letters of consent were sent to the parents of the selected participants, which described the purposes and nature of the study and detailed provisions on how to rescind consent if desired (Glassberg). Having ensured appropriate guidelines were met may have increased the willingness to participate in the study. Appropriate statistical analyses were completed.

The hypotheses stated that students in more restrictive settings will exhibit a wider array of serious academic and behavioural problems (Glassberg, 1994), which would limit placement within less restrictive settings. The results indicated that students in more restrictive settings demonstrated greater impairments and difficulties (Glassberg). Therefore, specific student characteristics predicted placement within different educational settings, whereby students demonstrating more problematic behaviours were segregated in more restrictive settings. To increase the probability of integration, specialized academic and behavioural programming would have to be implemented to develop the social and academic skills of these students. Teaching these skills would enable a student to portray more adaptive behaviours, which would thus

increase the likelihood of placement within a less restrictive educational setting.

Glassberg (1994) further demonstrated that age at time of diagnosis was a major factor in terms of where students with EBD were placed. Standards for appropriate behaviour may have been greater for older students and as a result, they were more likely to be placed in restrictive settings more often. It may also be assumed that the behaviours of these students were so well learned, that they were not afforded the same opportunities as younger students, as younger students were shown to be placed in mainstreamed classes more often (Glassberg). Older students may be viewed as less amenable to the strategies utilized in less restrictive settings and are therefore placed in more restrictive environments more often. Glassberg concluded by stating that while behavioural characteristics do play a role in placement options, they do not determine placement outcomes solely on their own accord. Further analysis needs to be documented to determine the variety of factors, which function to predict placement within specific educational settings.

Research highlighting the factors which predict the decision to integrate children with EBD into less restrictive educational settings, will enable administrators and educators to make provisions for these predictors to be present within a majority of school districts. Allowing teachers to have a voice in the decision-making process regarding potential reintegration appears to be an area requiring more attention. Teachers, who feel that external factors are forcing them to provide modifications for students with EBD and to integrate them within their classrooms, appear to demonstrate negative attitudes towards these students and also express resistance to integration initiatives.

Creating a positive school environment whereby integration is propagated as an alternative placement option, may in turn increase the probability that students with EBD will be transferred into less restrictive settings. A completely segregated educational environment isolated from the remainder of the school district, and apart from normal same-age peers, creates an 'us vs. them' stance. Such an orientation may ultimately prevent any decision to transfer

students with EBD into integrated settings.

Factors related to the success of integration.

It is commonly recognized that short-term placement within segregated settings may be beneficial in teaching students with EBD the strategies required to change their behaviours. Despite this, the ultimate goal is to assist students to leave this type of environment, to enter a setting where their academic, cognitive, and social needs can be more appropriately met (McLeer et al., 1993). Mainstreaming has been viewed as a desirable objective for children with EBD, in order for them to profit from the processes of normalization and identification with their normal same-age peers.

Within less restrictive environments, the behaviours of children with EBD are less intense (Glassberg, 1994) which serves to further reinforce integration as an option. In less restrictive settings, students with EBD have the opportunity to learn both behavioural and academic skills more closely related to the mainstream curriculum. It would be of interest to identify the factors contributing to the successful integration of students with EBD. The ultimate success of placement, within less restrictive educational settings, may be depend on how movement between settings is handled (McLeer et al., 1993).

First of all, it is imperative that an appropriate classroom be identified to ensure an appropriate match between the student and the general education teacher (McLeer et al., 1993). It is essential to consider the type of program, classroom, and teacher to ensure integration is successful (McLeer et al.). To appropriately match the student with their environment, it would be beneficial to identify the specific behavioural skills required of the student within their new educational environment and to focus intervention on the development of these specialized skills prior to transfer (McLeer et al.). To effectively provide opportunities for a child with EBD to learn the skills required within the new setting, communication and coordination is required (McLeer et al.), between the special and general education teachers. Rapport and collaborative planning is essential to ensuring the success of the student within an integrated classroom.

In a quasi-experimental study conducted by McLeer et al. (1993), the match between the expectancies of the classroom teacher and student behaviours was examined to assess the congruence between the two. Identifying differences between teacher's expectations for appropriate behaviour and the actual behavior of children with EBD will promote the ease of transition across placement settings, (McLeer et al.) by helping special education teachers to better equip students with more appropriate behaviours. Teaching students with EBD adequate strategies and techniques will help to ensure that integration into a less restrictive setting is successful.

McLeer et al. (1993) explored the utility of an assessment tool in aiding the transition between a hospital based school program and community-based programs. This particular research project was a pilot study conducted to determine the efficacy of the Assessments for Integration into Mainstreaming Settings (AIMS System) developed by Walker (1986) in contributing to successful integration. Data were collected for 17 elementary school students who transferred out of institutional settings during a specific time period. The students were 65% male and demonstrated wide variability in academic performance (McLeer et al.), suggesting a heterogeneous sample. Due to the heterogeneity of the sample, a larger group of participants should have been utilized for this pilot study (Gall et al., 1996). As a result, the sample may have not been a representative sample of students with EBD, thus limiting the population validity of the research study.

McLeer et al. (1993) provided a thorough description of the treatment program and the types of students typically admitted for treatment. When the 17 students were identified for transfer, the hospital teacher rated the student's behaviour and the receiving teacher completed a questionnaire indicating their behavioural expectations for classroom performance (McLeer et al.). Evidence for the reliability and validity of the AIMS system was not provided. Two forms of the questionnaire were completed. The hospital teachers completed the Walker Rankin (WR) Rating Scale of Adaptive and Maladaptive Child Behavior in School and the receiving teachers

used the SBS Inventory of Teacher Social Behavior Standards and Expectations. The receiving teachers were asked to rate their expectations for both positive and negative behaviours (McLeer et al.).

McLeer et al. (1993) did not provide thorough descriptions of the survey items, so it would be difficult to determine whether the instrument would be useful for a particular reader's purposes. Limited descriptive information was provided for the 17 students for whom the survey instrument was utilized to assess. In addition, descriptive information was not discussed for either the hospital or community based teachers who completed the questionnaire. It was therefore difficult to ascertain whether these specific schoolteachers were representative of all teachers in hospital treatment programs and of all teachers receiving children with EBD for mainstreaming. Therefore, the results may have had limited generalizability, beyond the scope of this pilot study. Furthermore, the authors did not describe how their statistical analyses were conducted. McLeer et al. performed only basic descriptive statistical analyses. One-way ANOVA's or t-tests could have been conducted to ascertain whether the ratings of different types of behaviours were statistically significant.

The results of the survey indicated that receiving teachers expressed a "need of order and compliance with rules and most frequently rated aggression, anger, and sexuality/obscenity as unacceptable" (McLeer et al., 1993, p. 52). Further data analysis, based on the ratings of the hospital teachers, suggested that the students were "acceptably skilled in complying with rules and demands, but less skilled at tasks requiring attention, self-direction, and flexibility" (McLeer et al., p. 54). On the other hand, these students evidenced few of the behaviours receiving teachers deemed unacceptable.

Within practical settings there may not be adequate time to remediate the complex skill deficiencies evidenced by these children, prior to transition to a less restrictive placement setting (McLeer et al., 1993). The implications of this study suggested that efforts should be taken to teach skills focusing on flexibility, self-direction, and attention, to all students prior to transition

into an integrated educational setting. This tool could help serve as a proactive tool to identify the behaviours that need to be changed to increase the likelihood of successful integration. It is essential to note that students should be taught these skills under a variety of settings, at a variety of times, and with many people to ensure the effects of intervention are generalized.

In relation to the research presented by McLeer et al. (1993), Muscott (1996) examined the standards teachers of students with EBD held for classroom behaviour. It was evident from this research, that to ensure the probability of successful reintegration into less restrictive educational environments, a match between teacher's expectations for behaviour and the current level of functioning of students must be achieved. Muscott highlighted the utility of identifying teacher expectations for behaviour. Providing opportunities for students identified as EBD to learn the social, interpersonal, and academic skills required for the achievement of desired educational outcomes are thus warranted.

To achieve responsible inclusion based on the notion of "goodness of fit" (Muscott, 1996, p. 302), or congruence between the demands of the educational setting and student behaviour, it is imperative that special education teachers assist students to meet the particular behavioural demands of the receiving teacher. Little research has been conducted on whether standards of behaviour vary as a function of placement. If differences for expected classroom behaviour do exist across varied educational settings, it would be informative to highlight these specific areas of variability to enable teachers to identify what specific competencies their students need, to increase the likelihood and success of integration.

Muscott (1996) hypothesized that there would be higher standards for student behaviour in less restrictive settings. This hypothesis is directly comparable to the study conducted by Glassberg (1994), completed to determine whether particular behavioural characteristics of students affected the decision to reintegrate. Glassberg found that as the intensity of the educational setting increased, the severity of maladaptive student behavioural and academic skills also increased. It was evident that teachers hold different expectations for both maladaptive and

adaptive patterns of behaviour. In order to improve the probability of successful reintegration of students with EBD, it would be beneficial to isolate the behavioural standards held by teachers in particular settings and to cater individualized student programming to conform with these standards.

Muscott (1996) surveyed 108 teachers from four different educational settings to assess teacher standards for behaviour, utilizing the Classroom Participation Scale: Teacher Standards Instrument (CPS: TSI). The four placements were resource rooms, special classes, special schools, and residential schools. A pilot study using the CPS: TSI with 30 special education teachers was first completed. Two measures of instrument reliability were reported, although evidence for the validity of the instrument was not provided. Teachers rated items on a six-point Likert-type scale, which assessed the amount of behavior that students with EBD could exhibit for the teachers to consider the placement an appropriate one (Muscott). Examples of the survey items were presented and Muscott outlined what the rating scale scores meant.

The sample was well described, thus improving both population validity and the generalizability of the research findings. Muscott (1996) utilized thorough criterion sampling procedures to ensure a representative sample of special and general education teachers was obtained. The sample was drawn from teachers within four different educational settings, from a particular geographic region in New York Sate. Forty-six public and private programs for students with behaviour disorders were contacted to participate in the study, although the total number of teachers who could have received the survey instrument was not specified. The return rate was 45%, which thus limited both the population and ecological validity of the results. Although a representative sample was used, a low return rate limits the generalizability of the results. It was not indicated whether a follow-up was conducted to improve the rate of return.

Although a sample size of 108 teachers was appropriate for this comparative study (Gall et al., 1996), the low rate of return could have potentially influenced the results. Those who responded to the survey may have been interested in the study, while nonrespondents may have

been reluctant to put forward their views. It would have been of interest to obtain surveys from a representative sample of nonrespondents to determine whether they held different opinions and perceptions about behavioural standards for students with EBD.

Appropriate data analysis was completed on the survey data. Muscott (1996) conducted a 4 X 2 factorial analysis of variance to "compare whether standards of behavior differed as a function of cascade placement or instructional level" (p. 306). The results indicated that there was more overlap and variability in differentiation of standards at the elementary level than at the secondary level (Muscott). At the secondary level, not as much differentiation of behavioural standards was evidenced across the four placement levels, which may contribute to the fact that high school students with EBD are rarely included within mainstreamed settings (Muscott).

At both the elementary and secondary levels, teachers had the highest standards for performance within the resource room. Across the remaining three placement settings, expectations for behaviour standards decreased as the intensity of the setting increased, which was similar to the findings of Glassberg (1994). At the secondary level, teachers had higher expectations for the behaviour of students with EBD in separate special schools and residential schools than elementary teachers did in similar settings (Muscott). It would appear that elementary school teachers set and expect higher standards for behavioural performance, and perhaps hold and exhibit more positive attitudes towards implementing behaviour change (Muscott).

To promote the successful integration of students with EBD within less restrictive educational settings, it is evident that educators should prepare students with EBD to meet the behavioural expectations of the receiving teacher. Matching teacher expectations for behaviour to student behaviour may increase the probability that students with EBD are transferred into less restrictive settings and may enable students with EBD to learn more appropriate ways of functioning.

On the other end of the spectrum, Bullock et al. (1985) conducted a comparative study to

assess the specific behavioural characteristics of students with EBD across five different educational settings, whereas Muscott (1996) looked only at the standards for behaviour. Lack of differentiation of student behaviour characteristics could have educational implications, as differences could potentially lead to inappropriate diagnosis and placement of these identified students (Bullock et al.). This is directly related to the research of Muscott (1996) and McLeer et al. (1993); these two studies suggested that teachers hold different expectations for behaviour depending upon the placement setting. To increase the success of integration, it is imperative that teacher expectations are matched to student behaviour. If lack of differentiation exists between settings, it would be more difficult to match the behaviours of teachers and students and the transition to a less restrictive environment would, thus, be more complicated.

The teachers in the study conducted by Bullock et al. (1985) completed the Behavioral Dimensions Ratings Scale (BDRS) on 1078 students identified as behaviourally disordered, across five separate placement settings. Although descriptive information was presented on the sample of students, descriptive information was not provided about the teachers who completed the survey. A representative sample of students was obtained. Teachers with primary responsibility for these students completed the BDRS, which was designed to rate students with EBD on 30 pairs of adjectives describing both maladaptive and adaptive behaviours (Bullock et al.). Reliability and validity information for the BDRS was not provided.

A description of selection procedures for both the surveyed teachers and the students utilized for participation in the study was not reported. The results of the study cannot be adequately generalized, as it is not known whether inappropriate sampling techniques were utilized. Evidence of a pilot study was not provided, nor were specifications documented regarding how many teachers could have potentially completed the questionnaire.

Appropriate data analyses were completed to generate the results of the survey, which included a factor analysis. The results indicated that teacher perceptions of the nature and severity of behaviour vary across setting type (Bullock et al., 1985), although differences in

behaviour did not exist across every setting. Significant differences across settings were noted for the following behaviours: (a) aggressive/acting out, (b) irresponsible/inattentive, and (c) tranquil/confident (Bullock et al.).

Differences in these sets of behaviours would suggest that teachers are not applying standardized expectations for behaviour across educational settings. As a result, students may be inappropriately placed and may not receive adequate individualized education plans catered to their specific deficits. If students are simply placed wherever teachers see fit, the likelihood of successful integration within a less restrictive environment will inevitably decrease.

From the research presented above, it is evident that a host of teacher and student characteristics exist, which improve the probability of success within a less restrictive environment. It is imperative that educators identify teachers' standards for behaviour within a variety of settings, to best determine where a student with EBD should be placed. In order for a student to achieve desirable educational outcomes, a close match between the student and the demands of their environment must be attained. Without isolating the standards which teachers place on particular behaviours, educators are setting up conditions for students to fail. Identification of teacher standards for behaviour may also help to determine the level of assistance required by students with EBD, by assisting educators to determine those specific competencies which EBD students have not achieved. Providing students with an opportunity to learn adaptive behaviours, based on teacher standards, may ultimately lead to more appropriate diagnosis and placement.

Students with EBD are among the group of learners most often segregated in restrictive educational settings, and are often the least likely to be provided with the opportunity to be successfully mainstreamed (Muscott, 1996). Developing programs to teach these students social, interpersonal, behavioural, and academic skills based on the expectations of teachers within less restrictive settings, should improve the probability that children with EBD will be integrated and will attain positive outcomes. Educators have a responsibility to assist these students to

accomplish goals and objectives which are individualized to their respective needs, although these students must also be provided with opportunities to achieve success within less restrictive environments. Providing opportunities for students with EBD to learn behaviours that more closely conform to societal expectations will likely allow them to function more appropriately in all spheres, especially since segregated settings do not reflect the reality of current society. A necessary first step then, is to identify teacher standards for behaviour.

Conclusion

For society to function as a system, especially one, which affords its members certain rights and privileges, its members are expected to conform to specific expectations based on the notion of control. Schwean, Saklofske, Schatz, and Falk (1996) presented the argument that society cannot continue to exist in its present state without assuring that the behaviour and activity of its members does not vary from set group norms. These authors further asserted that schools serve as a "primary socializing agency" (p. 34) for its students. As such, schools are in a position to provide training for their students to both learn and display behaviours, attitudes, and beliefs predicated on conformity to societal expectations. In the case of students with EBD, this notion of control is of importance. Schools strive to change the disruptive behaviours of these students, by placing them in educational settings where they are taught the social skills required for success. Current literature indicates that deficits in social skills, rejection by peers, and poor teacher and peer relationships are all factors which prevent students with EBD from achieving success in a regular classroom (Meadows et al., 1994).

If the goal of inclusion and integration is to improve the social competencies of students with EBD (Lewis, Chard, & Scott, 1994), certain questions remain unanswered. Why do students with EBD continue to be segregated in restrictive educational settings? Why does the integration of these students continue to present such challenges? It has been indicated that students with EBD have the most difficulty meeting the behavioural expectations of general education classrooms (Lewis et al., 1994). Why then, are students with EBD unable to achieve success? Is

adequate knowledge of the behavioural standards expected of these children not available?

To achieve responsible integration, based on goodness of fit, the demands of the receiving teacher should be taken into account (Wong, Kauffman, & Lloyd, 1993). It is the responsibility of both the receiving teacher and the student's current teacher(s) to discuss the behavioural standards students of the receiving teacher are expected to meet. Selection of an appropriate educational environment is not possible without first determining whether the student is able to meet the behavioural demands of the teacher. In order to achieve successful integration, the standards that teachers hold for student behaviour must be identified.

Research Objectives

Muscott (1996) completed a comparative study to determine whether teachers' standards for the behaviour of students with EBD differed between teachers within resource rooms, special classes, special schools, and residential schools. The present study was a partial replication of the study completed by Muscott, to determine whether teachers have different expectations for the behaviour of students with EBD by educational setting. The current study extended the work of Muscott to determine whether regular and special education teachers have different standards or expectations for the behaviour of students with EBD. Based on the review of the literature, it is expected that regular education (mainstream) teachers will have higher standards for the behaviour of students with EBD than special education teachers.

The procedures used to address the research questions are discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter III

Methodology

Participants

Approval was obtained from the ethics committee within the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Alberta, prior to any contact with the participants involved in the study. The participants were provided with a written, informed consent form to ensure they fully understood the purposes of the research study, an explanation of the methods to be used to gather the data, an estimate of the time commitment to participate in the study, a description of what the findings were to be used for, a list of who would have access to the findings, and reasons why the participants were selected to be involved in the study. Participants in the study were provided with safeguards to: (a) protect anonymity, maintain confidentiality, and ensure freedom from undue harm, (b) ensure the right to withdraw from the study without penalty, (c) ensure voluntary consent, (d) be informed of the findings, and (e) arrange for debriefing after completion of the questionnaire (Gall et al., 1996). The phone number of the principal researcher was provided to the participants in the event that difficulties or questions arose.

The participants were selected from a sample of elementary school teachers from a school district within a large Western Canadian metropolitan city. Elementary teachers who met the specific criterion of those who have taught, or are currently teaching, students with EBD in either a general education classroom (regular program) or a specialized behaviour classroom were surveyed, to determine their standards for students' behaviour. A non-experimental (comparative) approach was utilized to determine whether teacher standards for students' behaviour differed between the two settings. This study was intended to replicate, in part, the work of Muscott (1996), although teachers from only two settings were compared at one instructional level (elementary), as compared to Muscott who sampled teachers from four settings at both the elementary and high school levels. The present study extended the work of Muscott by surveying regular education teachers and comparing their standards for the behaviour of

students with EBD to those of special education teachers.

The number of participants was dependent upon the number of accessible schools. Fourteen schools were surveyed and data were obtained from 11 of the 14 schools during the month of February 2000. A minimum of 15 participants from each of the two groups was required to ensure appropriate statistical power and representativeness of the sample (Gall et al., 1996). The total obtained sample consisted of 51 teachers, from 11 schools within the school district. There were 35 general education teachers and 16 special education teachers in the sample. Of the 51 participants, there were 11 males and 40 females. Forty-five participants reported their age. These 45 participants ranged in age from 23 to 62 years, with an average age of 40.31 years (SD = 10.71).

Instrument

The Classroom Participation Scale: Teacher Standards Instrument (CPS: TSI), a 40-item questionnaire developed by Tannenbaum and Muscott (1986), designed to assess teacher standards for the behaviour of students with EBD, was used to gather data. Included as part of the research materials were (a) an introductory letter, (b) a consent form, (c) directions for completion of the survey, (d) 10 questions requesting demographic information, and (e) the 40-item CPS: TSI questionnaire. Teachers were also asked to report the amount and type of behaviour children assigned to their classrooms should exhibit (Muscott).

Examples of the questionnaire items included the following (a) behaviour on field trips, "the student exhibits appropriate behaviour in the community on field trips" and (b) self-abusive behaviour, "the student engages in behaviour such as head banging, biting (him) herself etc. when provoked by other children" (Tannenbaum & Muscott, 1986). A six point Likert-type scale was used to rate the questionnaire items. The rating scale ranged from one to six (1, always; 2, nearly always; 3, frequently; 4, occasionally; 5, hardly ever; and 6, never). The item ratings were developed so that a low score indicated a higher degree of standards for the behaviour of students with EBD within their respective classrooms.

Positively and negatively worded items were reverse coded. In other words, an item that described an adaptive pattern of behaviour such as independent work would receive a rating from one to six, with a one denoting that the behaviour is always expected. An item that described a maladaptive behaviour such as disruption would also receive a rating from one to six; however, a one would denote that the behaviour is never tolerated.

To determine the appropriateness of the survey instrument for the specific research purposes, two educational experts within the field of special education and educational research examined the questionnaire. One expert was male and one expert was female, both of whom were within the 40-60 year age range. The experts were asked to provide recommendations regarding the wording and structure of the questionnaire items and the inclusion or exclusion of any of the 40 questionnaire items. Items were checked to determine their meanings to ensure adequate content validity. This process resulted in changes to the introductory letter, the informed consent form, and the background information form. No changes were made to the questionnaire. In a pilot study conducted by Muscott (1996), the test-retest reliability of the instrument was .95 and the internal consistency reliability coefficient was also .95.

Item 9 was removed from the analysis due to an error on the part of the principal researcher. The remaining 39 items were coded and utilized for statistical analyses. Based upon the individual item ratings, a total score was calculated, which represented the standards a teacher within one of the two settings held for the behaviour of students with EBD. The total score ranged from a low score of 39 to a high score of 234, with a low score indicating a higher degree of standards for the behaviour of students with EBD.

Procedure

In January 2000, the principals of 26 elementary schools, which served children with EBD, within the selected school district were pre-contacted to determine their level of interest in the research project and to seek permission to request their school to participate in the study. Fourteen principals agreed to participate. Formal approval to conduct the research was then

obtained from the Associate Dean within the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Alberta. The research liaison person within the identified school district was contacted to make the final decision regarding the researcher's access to the 14 schools. Permission to contact the 14 schools was granted in February 2000 and data were obtained from 11 of the 14 schools. Three schools declined to participate in the study.

Telephone contact was made with the school principals to further explain the purposes of the study and to ensure the willingness of the school to participate. Dates and times were scheduled for the researcher to hand deliver the questionnaires to each of the schools. Teachers within the 11 schools were asked to volunteer for the study. Although the original research goal was to include a group of teachers from resource rooms, the complexity of coordinating access to schools, in addition to time constraints and lack of available participants, prevented this from occurring. A presentation was made to the staff at one school to explain the study and three telephone calls were answered. A date and time to pick up the completed questionnaires was arranged with the school principals. Data were collected from responses to the CPS: TSI.

The following chapter describes the results of the study.

Chapter IV

Results

Statistical Procedures

The data were gathered through a questionnaire format. Each questionnaire item was coded and entered into SPSS 9.0 for Windows. SPSS is a statistical package designed to manage, analyze, and display data (Gall et al., 1996). An alpha level of .05 was used for all inferential statistical tests. Background information was analyzed for both groups of teachers who completed the questionnaire, which included regular education and special education teachers. Descriptive statistics, for both groups, were computed on the items surveyed in the questionnaire. This descriptive analysis provided an overview of the expectations of each group of participants, on the questionnaire. A total test score was calculated from the responses to the test items, which reflected the standards regular education teachers and special education teachers held for the behaviour of students with EBD.

The study yielded data that were analyzed through the use of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA). ANOVAs were completed to determine whether there were any significant differences between the two groups of participants on the total test score. Product-moment correlation coefficients (r) were also computed, to analyze the direction and magnitude of the relationship between variables assessed on the questionnaire, to determine whether any specific variables were related to standards for behaviour. Correlation coefficients were computed between the independent variables: age of participant, total number of years teaching, number of years teaching in current position, number of years teaching students with EBD, and the total score on the questionnaire.

General Characteristics of the Participants

The total sample of 51 teachers included 11 males and 40 females. Forty-five participants reported their age. These 45 participants ranged in age from 23 to 62 years, with an average age of 40.31 years (SD = 10.71). Regarding maximum education level, 47 (92%) of the

participants had completed a Bachelor Degree Program, three (6%) had completed a Graduate Degree Program, and 1 (2%) had completed a Diploma Degree Program. Four (8%) participants were in the process of completing an advanced degree. (see Table 1).

Table 1

Gender, Age, and Level of Education of Regular and Special Education Teachers

	Type of Teacher		
Variable	Regular	Special	Total
Gender	35	16	51
Male	5	6	11
Female	30	10	40
Age			
M	43.62	34.31	40.31
SD	10.23	9.02	10.71
Level of Education			
Diploma Program	1	0	1
Bachelor Program	32	15	47
Graduate Program	2	1	3

As can be seen from Table 1, 35 of the 51 participants were general education (regular) teachers. Of the 35 regular education teachers, 30 (86%) were female and 5 (14%) were male. The participants ranged in age from 23 to 62 years of age, with an average age of 43.62 years (SD = 10.23) (29 out of 35 teachers reported their age). The majority of the general education

teachers had completed a Bachelor Degree (91%) and two participants had completed a Graduate Degree (6%). One participant had completed a Diploma Degree (3%). The sample of regular education teachers was comprised of participants from nine of the 11 participating schools and 14 (40%) participants came from one of two schools.

Table 1 indicates that 16 of the 51 participants were special education teachers. Six (38%) of the special education teachers were male and 10 (63%) were female. The participants ranged in age from 25 to 57, with an average age of 34.31 years (SD = 9.02). Fifteen (94%) of the special education teachers had completed a Bachelor Degree and one (6%) had completed a Graduate Degree. Special education teachers from nine of the 11 participating schools completed questionnaires.

The teachers from both the regular and special education classrooms were predominantly female, with males representing a small percentage of each group of participants. Teachers from the regular education classes were older, on average, than teachers from specialized behaviour classrooms. In regards to education, the majority of the teachers from both groups had completed a Bachelor Degree program and a small number had completed a Graduate Degree program. The same number of regular and special education teachers were currently in the process of completing an advanced degree.

As shown in Table 2, the participants have been teaching from 6 months to 35 years, with an average of 14.04 (SD = 9.99) years (50 of the 51 participants provided information). Of the 51 participants, 37 reported teaching students with EBD from zero to 19 years. The mean number of years spent teaching students with EBD was 5.45 (SD = 5.67) years. (see Table 2).

Table 2

Total Years Teaching, Total Years Teaching in Current Position, and Total Years Teaching Students with EBD for Regular and Special Education Teachers

	Type of Teacher		
Variable	Regular	Special	Total
Total years teaching			
M	17.04	7.67	14.04
SD	9.54	7.89	9.99
Total years teaching in current position			
M	4.96	4.16	4.70
SD	4.22	3.69	4.04
Total years teaching students with EBD			
M	5.29	5.72	5.45
SD	6.48	4.59	5.67

As indicated in Table 2, general education teachers have been teaching from 6 months to 35 years, with an average of 17.04 (SD = 9.54) years. The participants have been in their current teaching positions on average 4.96 (SD = 4.22) years, with a range of 3 months to 16 years. Of the 35 regular education teachers, 21 indicated that they had been working with students with EBD from zero to 19 years, with an average of 5.29 (SD = 6.47) years.

Table 2 shows that special education teachers have a mean number of years teaching of 7.67 (SD = 7.89) years, with a range of 1 to 32 years. The participants have been working in their current schools on average 4.16 (SD = 3.69) years, ranging from 6 months to 12 years. Table 2 also indicates that special education teachers have been teaching students with EBD from 1 to 15 years, with an average of 5.72 (SD = 4.59) years.

The results indicate that regular education teachers have been teaching, on average, longer than have special education teachers, although both groups of teachers have been employed in their current positions for approximately the same length of time. It would appear that the special education teachers have been teaching students with EBD for approximately 9 months longer, on average, than regular class teachers.

Table 3 presents the average rating for each group of participants on the questionnaire, which reflects the standards for the behaviour of students with EBD. The results indicated that regular education teachers had an average total score of 86.20 (SD = 22.50), with a range from 47 to 151 points. Special education teachers reported a mean total score of 125.00 (SD = 25.49), which ranged from 79 to 165 points. A low score reflects the expectation of a higher level of standards for the behaviour of students with EBD. The results would then indicate that regular education teachers had higher standards for the behaviour of students with EBD, compared to special education teachers.

Table 3

Mean Total Questionnaire Score for Regular and Special Education Teachers

	Type of Teacher		
Variable	Regular	Special	Total Group
Total Score			
M	86.20	125.00	98.37
SD	22.50	25.49	29.49

Note. A low score reflects a higher degree of standards for the behaviour of students with EBD.

Table 4 presents the mean rating for males and females on the questionnaire, which reflects the standards for the behaviour of students with EBD. The results indicated that males had a mean rating of 116.55 (*SD* = 36.84), with a range from 61 to 165 points. Female teachers reported a mean rating of 93.38 (*SD* = 25.46), which ranged from 47 to 151 points. This indicates that male teachers had lower standards for the behaviour of students with EBD than female teachers.

Table 4

Mean Total Questionnaire Score for Male and Female Teachers

	Gender of Teacher		
Variable	Male	Female	Total Group
Total Score			
M	116.55	93.38	98.37
SD	36.84	25.46	29.49

Note. A low score reflects a higher degree of standards for the behaviour of students with EBD.

Four separate one-way ANOVAs were computed and a significance level of .05 was used. The first one-way ANOVA was computed to determine whether the mean difference in the total questionnaire score between regular and special education teachers was statistically significant (see Table 5). The analysis showed that the two groups of participants had significantly different total scores on the questionnaire, which indicated that regular education and special education teachers rate the behaviours of students with EBD differently. The second one-way ANOVA was computed to determine whether the mean difference in the total questionnaire score between males and females was statistically significant (see Table 6). The effect of gender produced significant results $F(1, 50) = 5.84$, $p = .02$).

Table 5

Analysis of Variance of Total Questionnaire Score for Regular and Special Education Teachers

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	16530.32	1	16530.32	30.04	.000
Within Groups	26959.60	49	550.196		
Total	49489.92	50			

Table 6

Analysis of Variance of Total Questionnaire Score for Male and Female Teachers

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4631.82	1	4631.82	5.84	.019
Within Groups	38858.10	49	793.02		
Total	43489.92	50			

The third and fourth one-way ANOVAs were computed to determine the interaction between gender and type of teacher on the total questionnaire score (see Tables 7 & 8). The results indicate that gender had an effect on the total score of special education teachers, with female special education teachers reporting a mean rating of 115.40 (SD = 21.22) and male

special education teachers reporting a mean rating of 141.00 (SD = 25.43) (see Table 8). This suggests that female special education teachers had significantly higher standards for the behaviour of students with EBD than their male colleagues. Gender did not have an effect on the total questionnaire score for regular education teachers (see Table 7).

Table 7

Analysis of Variance of Total Questionnaire Score for Male and Female Regular Education Teachers

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.83	1	5.83	.011	.916
Within Groups	17209.77	33	521.51		
Total	17215.60	34			

Table 8

Analysis of Variance of Total Questionnaire Score for Male and Female Special Education Teachers

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5457060	1	2457.650	4.72	.047
Within Groups	7286.40	14	520.46		
Total	9744.00	15			

The results indicate that special education teachers have significantly lower standards for the behaviour of students with EBD than regular education teachers. Female teachers have significantly higher standards for the behaviour of students with EBD than male teachers, although it would appear that the effect of gender produced significant results for special education teachers, but not regular education teachers.

Product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to determine whether the demographic variables of age, total years teaching, total years in current position, or total years teaching students with EBD was related to the standards teachers, within either general education or specialized behaviour classrooms, held for the behaviour of students with EBD. (see Table 9).

Table 9

Intercorrelations Between Age, Total Years Teaching, Total Years in Current Position, Total Years Teaching Students with EBD, and Total Questionnaire Score

	Total Score		
Variable	Regular	Special	Total Group
1. Age	-.12	-.53*	-.46**
2. Total years teaching	.11	-.49	-.35*
3. Years in current position	.24	-.24	-.01
4. Years teaching students with EBD	.48*	-.44	-.27

Note. Total group = Total group of participants (n = 51); Regular education teachers (n = 35); Special education teachers (n = 16).

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

As presented in Table 9, the correlation between age and standards for behaviour, for the total group of participants, was -.46 ($p = .002$). This indicates that as teacher age increases, the standards teachers have for the behaviour of students with EBD also increases (a low score denotes a higher degree of standards). The results also showed that the total number of years teaching had a significant relationship to standards for behaviour ($r = -.35$, $p = .013$).

The number of years which regular education teachers have been teaching students with

EBD was significantly related to their standards for student behaviour (r = -.48, p = .029). This indicates that as teaching experience for regular education teachers increases, the standards for behaviour also increases (a low score reflects a higher degree of standards). Age of special education teachers was significantly related to standards for behaviour (r = -.53, p = .037).

Summary of Findings

The results demonstrate that special education teachers have lower standards for the behaviour of students with EBD, as compared to regular education teachers. These findings confirm the research questions. In addition, males have lower standards for behaviour, although the effect of gender appeared to interact with the total questionnaire score for special education teachers only. Age was significantly related to the total questionnaire score for the total group of participants, indicating that as teacher age increases, standards for behaviour also increase. Total number of years teaching also had a significant relationship to the standards teachers have for the behaviour of students with EBD.

The following chapter discusses the results of the study.

Chapter V

Discussion and Conclusions

Introduction

The results of the present study indicate that general and special education teachers, who teach students with EBD, have different standards for the behaviour of these students. The analysis shows that teachers within the regular education program appear to have higher standards, than special education teachers, for the behaviour of students with EBD. This may indicate that teachers from specialized behaviour classrooms tolerate more problematic behaviour than their colleagues, teaching students with EBD, within the general education program.

The present study was intended to replicate, in part, the work of Muscott (1996), who found significant differences in behavioural standards at the elementary level, between teachers teaching students with EBD within resource rooms, special classes, special schools, and residential schools, although some variability did exist. The current study extended the work of Muscott, by surveying regular education teachers and comparing their ratings for the behaviour of students with EBD to the ratings of special education teachers. The results of the present study confirm the principle discussed by Muscott, by indicating that as educational settings increased in terms of restrictiveness, teacher standards for behaviour decreased. This finding demonstrates that teachers in non-mainstreamed settings have lower standards for behaviour. It would appear that as students with EBD move away from regular education classrooms, teachers have lower standards and expectations for their behaviour.

The results of the present study are further supported by research conducted by Bullock et al. (1985), which demonstrated that teacher ratings for the behaviour of youth with behaviour disorders varied across settings, which included residential treatment centers, psychiatric hospitals, and resource rooms. The findings of Bullock et al. suggested there were differential standards for behaviour between educational settings, a finding demonstrated in the present study.

Muscott (1996) suggested that teachers more closely connected with the general

education classroom have higher standards for the behaviour of students with EBD. In order to appropriately meet the needs of students with EBD, Muscott indicated that it would be beneficial to identify teacher standards for behaviour, to determine what behaviours students should exhibit to experience success within their classroom environment. The overall results of the current study indicated that teachers within specialized behaviour classrooms were found to have statistically significant differences in perceptions and ratings of behaviour, than teachers in mainstream settings. There are several possible reasons for the findings of the present study, which the following section will discuss.

General Education Teachers

As a group, teachers from general education classrooms have higher standards for the amount and type of behaviour children with EBD, assigned to their classrooms, should exhibit. Participants indicated that students within their classrooms were expected to exhibit patterns of adaptive behaviour, which included initiating work independently, starting and finishing work under supervision, accepting changes in routine, forming positive relationships with both their classmates and teachers, and demonstrating appropriate behaviour under normal circumstances and situations, the majority of the time. In order to facilitate the academic, cognitive, social, and behavioural development of each student, regular education teachers appear to set specific standards for their students as a whole, and hold high expectations in regards to meeting and achieving these standards. It would appear that all students, including those identified as EBD, are held to the same standards for behaviour.

Teacher standards for behaviour.

It is evident that promoting adaptive, socially desirable behaviours would facilitate the emotional and psychological health of children with EBD, although encouraging such behaviours would inevitably promote the development and well being of all students within the classroom. Furthermore, the overall atmosphere and learning environment of a classroom would be affected by allowing children with EBD to display disruptive behaviours on a regular basis. When

children with EBD do not respond appropriately to teacher intervention and instruction, the climate of the entire classroom is inevitably altered.

Non-disordered children may be negatively affected by a change within their surroundings, particularly when they are disrupted by the presentation of externalizing, acting out behaviours on the part of their classmates. The presence of disruptive behaviours without teacher intervention may serve as a source of contagion. As a result, students who do not typically display maladaptive behaviours may begin to act out, with the knowledge that teachers are tolerant of such behaviours. It would therefore appear that placing children with EBD within mainstreamed educational settings would require setting higher standards for their behaviour.

With the influx of children with special needs being served within mainstream educational settings, which includes students with EBD, an adjustment of teacher standards for behaviour may have been required. To appropriately serve students with EBD in the general education program, teachers may have shifted their standards to expecting more adaptive behaviour and tolerating less disruptive behaviour. It would therefore appear that the role of the regular education teacher is instrumental to the development of adaptive behaviour in students.

Considering that children spend a majority of their formative years within the school environment, the role of the teacher is important. The educational setting provides the opportunity for academic learning in addition to social, emotional, and behavioural learning. As a result, schools are in a position to facilitate the overall development of children, in conjunction and cooperation with parents. Teachers who hold high standards for behaviour are therefore assisting children, both with and without EBD, to learn to respond appropriately and constructively towards others, in the development of adequate coping and adjustment behaviours, and self-esteem, in addition to meeting their learning needs. In conversation with six participants within the current study, it was indicated that it was essential to have predetermined, set rules and expectations for students, in order to facilitate the development of a positive learning atmosphere and to further the growth of each child.

Teaching experience and standards for behaviour.

Of particular interest was the fact that the number of years spent teaching students with EBD was inversely related to the standards general education teachers held for the behaviour of students with EBD. This would suggest that as teaching experience increased, standards for behaviour also increased (a low score denotes a high degree of standards). This finding suggests that teacher standards for behaviour change over time, towards expecting children with EBD to exhibit more adaptive behaviours and less disruptive behaviours.

Teacher standards for behaviour may be a function of experience, as with increased experience teachers improve their skills in dealing with difficult children. As a result, teachers may set higher standards for themselves, which may translate into expecting more from their students. Another possible reason for this noted increase in behavioural standards may be related to recent educational policy changes, which advocate for the integration of children with special needs, to the greatest extent possible. As a result, educators must strive towards maximizing the successful integration of children with EBD, and increasing teacher standards for behaviour is therefore logical to facilitate this process.

Concluding statements.

It would appear that regular education teachers require high standards for behaviour, to encourage the successful development of adaptive behaviours in students with EBD. As the ultimate goal of integration is to provide a normalizing experience for children with EBD, allowing maladaptive behaviours to occur on a frequent basis would prevent students with EBD from achieving success within their classroom environment. To appropriately facilitate the transfer and generalization of adaptive behaviours and social skills to the community and home settings, and towards peers and adults outside of the realm of school, the learning environment of the regular education classroom must closely resemble that of the community setting. High standards for behaviour are therefore understandable. It would appear that regular education teachers want students to meet their standards for behaviour, whereby each student is expected to

perform and behave in a similar fashion.

Special Education Teachers

Teacher standards for behaviour.

The results demonstrate that teachers within specialized behaviour classrooms have lower standards for the behaviour of children with EBD. The types of behaviours that occur within this setting may affect how behaviour is interpreted and tolerated, as the varied nature of externalizing behaviours displayed by students with EBD would preclude the likelihood that special education teachers would have different standards for each student. Although a defining characteristic among students with EBD is the tendency to exhibit aggression, each student identified as EBD is not the same. Out of sheer necessity, special education teachers would require set standards for all students with EBD within the classroom. Special needs teachers may therefore develop lower standards for behaviour, to encompass the severity of disruptive behaviours expressed by each child with EBD.

It is likely that students with EBD assigned to specialized behaviour classrooms display a variety of maladaptive behaviours and invariably require the intensive supports of a segregated educational setting. Segregated behaviour classrooms are designed to teach children with EBD to more appropriately control and change their behaviours. The classroom environment typically functions to serve as a safe, supportive setting where students can learn about their behaviours, to ultimately experience success at school, home, and in the community. The nature of the setting affords students additional time to develop the necessary skills to alter their patterns of behaviour, through repetition of concepts, lower teacher standards, and a trusting and empathic relationship with their teacher.

Special education teachers may tolerate more disruptive behaviours due to the difficulties students with EBD have developing and maintaining acceptable and desirable behaviours. Expecting too much too soon may detrimentally affect the development of prosocial, proacademic behaviours, as students with EBD are typically not equipped with adequate coping

and adjustment strategies and have difficulties with learning. It may be more beneficial and effective for teachers to slowly increase their overall level of standards for behaviour, over time, although some minimum level of standards for behaviour is required.

The time of year teachers rate their standards for behaviour would therefore affect their ratings for behaviour. At the present time, the special education teachers surveyed within the study may hold different standards than they would have had at the beginning of the school year, or than they would have at the end of the school term. It is likely that standards and expectations for behaviour change throughout the year, to assist children with EBD to develop the skills necessary for transfer to less restrictive educational settings.

Gender and age of special education teachers and standards for behaviour.

The findings demonstrate that the teacher's gender was significantly related to the standards special education teachers had for behaviour. Female teachers had significantly higher standards for behaviour, than did male special education teachers. This result may be related to the gender of EBD students, as more males are identified as EBD (Bauer & Shea, 1999; Del'Homme et al., 1996; Dixon-Floyd & Johnson, 1997; Duncan et al., 1995). Although both male and female special education teachers are likely aware that students placed within specialized behaviour classrooms exhibit externalizing behaviours, male teachers may offer a unique perspective and may develop greater rapport with male students with EBD, thus interpreting their behaviours differently. It is also possible that due to basic gender differences, including the fact that males are stereotypically more aggressive than females, male teachers may have greater feelings of self-efficacy or feelings of control in terms of dealing with male students. As a result, male special education teachers may have lower ratings for the behaviour of students with EBD due to such perceived feelings of control and ability in dealing with disruptive behaviours.

The findings also indicate that age was correlated with standards for behaviour, suggesting that as the age of special education teachers increased, standards for behaviour also

increased. With increased age comes increased experience. As a result, teacher standards would invariably change to provide students with EBD greater opportunities for learning adaptive behaviours. It would appear that teacher standards for behaviour increase over time, towards expecting more adaptive behaviours from students with EBD.

Concluding statements.

The findings of the present study indicate that special education teachers have significantly lower standards for the behaviour of students with EBD than regular education teachers. The push for the integration of EBD students within mainstreamed settings may arise from differential standards between settings, as the ultimate goal for the education of children with EBD is to teach them skills to function within everyday society.

Limitations of the Present Study

There are particular aspects of this study that must be taken into account when interpreting the findings. First of all, the sample of elementary school teachers who volunteered to participate in the study was small. As a result, the findings of the present study may have limited generalizability to teachers other than those directly involved in the study. Caution should be taken if the results are to be generalized to a larger population of elementary teachers within either of the two placement settings studied here. In addition, ecological validity, the generalization of the results of the study to other contexts, may also be limited due to the aforementioned limitation of the study. Both the ecological and population validity of the study would be strengthened with a larger sample size.

Second, a follow-up with non-respondents was not completed. Had a follow-up been initiated, the sample size may have increased, which would have improved both the population and ecological validity of the study. In addition, a check on non-respondents was not conducted. A comparison of the ratings of respondents to non-respondents would have been helpful in determining whether or not the respondents were biased in their ratings. Furthermore, those individuals who did not complete the questionnaire may have had information useful for the

purposes of the study.

Third, the questionnaire was reported to be difficult to understand, interpret, and to complete. Several teachers indicated that the wording of the questionnaire items was confusing, due to the presentation of double negatives within specific items. In addition, it was reported that the six-point Likert type reporting scale was obscure. One teacher noted that 'occasionally' does not suggest the presentation of behaviour up to 50% of the time. Secondly, two teachers suggested that the completion instructions for the questionnaire were not appropriate. It was noted that the statement 'for you to consider the placement an appropriate one' should be removed from the questionnaire instructions. These two teachers queried whether or not the inclusion of this particular phrase would appropriately instruct teachers to interpret the questionnaire items and thus provide the type of information the study was designed to address. It was indicated that this statement would instruct participants to rate the frequency at which the listed behaviours occurred within their classrooms, as opposed to rating their standards for those behaviours. Thirdly, three teachers indicated that the scale was too gross a measure to complete with any sensitivity and that the reporting scale did not discriminate effectively enough to allow for accurate information to be provided. These three teachers reported that the scale did not allow for exceptions to be made, or for times when children with EBD could exhibit specific behaviours more than others.

Fourth, a formal, thorough pilot study was not implemented. Within the present study, two educational experts examined the questionnaire, although this may have resulted in many problems being overlooked. To appropriately generalize the findings to other populations and contexts, a pilot study would have to be initiated. It would have been both beneficial and informative to pilot the questionnaire on a group of elementary school teachers who were currently teaching students with EBD, in either of the two placement settings. As several of the participating teachers indicated that many of the items were difficult to understand and to interpret, it would have been useful to gather information from elementary teachers, regarding the

wording and structure of the questionnaire items. Recommendations provided by a representative sample of teachers might have improved the readability of the questionnaire items.

Fifth, a factor analysis was not completed on the questionnaire items. The results could be better interpreted and utilized with the completion of a factor analysis. Without this statistical procedure, any interpretations of individual performance and comparisons of general and special education teacher ratings for behaviour should be critically reviewed, as only overall performance was evaluated. Differences within and between groups may have been better reviewed and addressed through the use of a factor analysis. In addition, it would have been beneficial to complete two-way ANOVA's to isolate any potential interaction effects between the variables examined within the present study. The completion of more sophisticated statistical procedures would add to the utility of the questionnaire and the results of the study.

Finally, the possibility of response sets is present. Questionnaire data "reveals perceptions and opinions" (Johnson, 1997, p. 25) and should therefore be interpreted with caution. The responses of each of the participants may have been influenced by social desirability, or the "tendency to present oneself in a favorable light" (Gall et al., 1996, p. 271). One teacher reported apprehension in responding to the questionnaire, for fear of inadvertently providing information that had the potential to harm students, even though the participants were put at ease due to the measures taken to protect and ensure confidentiality and anonymity.

Implications for Practice

Although segregated educational environments are often necessary to meet the unique learning and behavioural needs of children identified as EBD, continual segregation within restrictive settings does not reflect the reality of society. In the spirit of fairness and equity, EBD children should be afforded the opportunity to experience movement between settings, into a classroom specifically catered to their individual needs. However, children with EBD continue to be segregated in restrictive environments, despite programming geared towards integration within mainstream settings. It has been indicated that fewer than 10% of students with EBD are likely to

be reintegrated into a regular program once placed in a special education program (Muscott, 1995). Educators should increase the rate at which students with EBD are integrated into mainstreamed educational settings, once these students demonstrate readiness for such movement.

McLeer et al. (1994) suggested that to best facilitate integration and success for students with EBD within the regular classroom, it is evident that open discussion and collaboration between special and general education teachers should be encouraged to assist in the development of mutual goals for their performance. In most Canadian schools, integration is commonly viewed as movement from the special education classroom to a regular classroom. To achieve responsible integration, based on the notion of "goodness of fit" (Muscott, 1996, p. 302), open discussion of behavioural standards is required, to assist students with EBD to meet the demands of the receiving teacher. Without determining the specific behaviours regular teachers expect of students with EBD, it would appear that these students are being set up for failure. Further studies by McLeer et al. (1994) and Bullock et al. (1985) support this view.

The findings of the present study indicate that there exist different standards for the behaviour of children with EBD between regular and special education teachers. In view of this finding, it would be beneficial to address teacher standards for behaviour, to best facilitate the integration of children with EBD. Rating scales designed to address the behaviours teachers expect of their students should be utilized (Muscott, 1996), which will invariably assist teachers to work towards common goals. As demonstrated by McLeer et al. (1993), how the transfer between settings is managed affects the success of children with EBD within less restrictive educational environments. Although identifying teacher standards for behaviour is necessary, successful integration cannot be achieved without first encouraging the placement of children with EBD into mainstreamed settings, once they are developmentally ready.

School wide programming that promotes integration as an option for students with EBD may increase the rate at which they are placed within settings other than the special education

classroom. Policies supporting the placement of students with EBD into mainstreamed settings may indirectly change the disruptive behaviours of these students, by motivating students with EBD to work towards changing their behaviours. However, behaviour change cannot be achieved without assistance from parents and educators.

Additional supports for children with EBD.

It would be beneficial to implement programming which encourages the role of parents in developing adaptive behaviours in children with EBD. Parents are instrumental in reinforcing and assisting the efforts of the school in teaching EBD students new, alternative ways of coping and adjusting to their environment. Increasing levels of parental involvement may assist EBD students to achieve greater social and psychological development, as opposed to increasing their risk for developing negative behaviours. Programming which advocates for cooperation between teachers and parents will further assist in the development of adaptive behaviour. Such a collaborative relationship may act as a buffer against the impact of maladaptive behaviours on the development of EBD students and on the success of integration within mainstreamed settings. Early intervention programming will also help families of children with EBD to improve the probability of success at school and successful interaction with teachers.

Teacher variables.

The role of teacher training and attitudes is important to ensure that students with EBD receive effective instruction. In addition, teachers commonly fear the integration of children with special needs, as teachers report little say in decision-making (Vaughn et al., 1996), which alters their overall attitude towards such movement. A role in decision-making provides the opportunity for teachers to voice their concerns, opinions, and perceptions regarding the integration of students with EBD. Schools encouraging the role of teachers may produce a positive school environment, as opposed to one fueled by hostility and negativism. Rock et al. (1995) and Myles and Simpson (1992) suggested that teacher input into decision-making affects attitudes towards the integration of students with EBD.

Overhauling schools to bring about a philosophy of integration may be necessary, although this may be difficult due to teacher attitudes towards integration. Inservice training may foster the development of more positive attitudes concerning the integration of students with EBD. Without identifying barriers to integration, it is evident that students with EBD will continue to be segregated. Programs, which enable teachers to collaborate and jointly plan for integration and to have a voice in decision making, are therefore necessary.

Implications for Further Research

The majority of current literature in this field focuses on the behaviour students with EBD display, although little research has been conducted on the standards teachers within different settings hold for the behaviour of children with EBD. Further research needs to be completed on teacher standards for behaviour, in order to increase the success of students with EBD within less restrictive educational settings. It would be beneficial to expand the present study to collect more data from teachers within regular and special education classrooms, and to collect data from teachers within resource rooms. As the study by Muscott (1996) focused on schools within the United States, it would be beneficial to further collect data within the Canadian context.

As most of the participants within the present study taught students within more than one grade level, it would be of interest to determine whether different standards exist for children of varying ages. Teachers of younger elementary school children may have different standards for behaviour than teachers of older elementary school children. In addition, it would be interesting to determine whether teacher standards differ by time of year.

Conclusions

This study found that there was a significant difference in teacher standards for the behaviour of children with EBD, between regular education and special education teachers. General education teachers had higher standards for behaviour than teachers in specialized behaviour classrooms. Regular education teachers may hold higher standards for behaviour to

encourage the development of all students within their classrooms, in addition to maintaining control of the classroom environment and to providing appropriate instruction. Students with EBD within specialized behaviour classrooms may have different opportunities to learn more appropriate behaviours. That is, teachers may teach at a slower pace and allow more time to learn. It would appear that time is a critical variable in teaching adaptive behaviours to students with EBD.

To facilitate the integration of students with EBD into less restrictive educational settings, the transfer between the special education and regular education classroom must be handled appropriately. A necessary first step is to identify teacher standards for student behaviour, to assist in the development of adaptive behaviours in students with EBD. Without such identification, students with EBD do not have the opportunity to learn new behaviours. Open discussion and collaboration between teachers should be encouraged to ensure that educators are working towards similar goals for the behaviour of EBD students.

Conversations with both regular and special education teachers within the present study, suggested concern for the appropriate education of students with EBD. Overall, it would appear that there exist positive attitudes towards the integration of students with EBD into less restrictive settings, provided teachers have appropriate supports and say in decision making. Furthermore, it appeared that within schools, which encouraged a philosophy of integration of all students, teacher attitudes towards integration were not as apprehensive.

The education of students with EBD poses a challenge to teachers and schools. Students must be prepared to learn more appropriate behaviours, in order to demonstrate success within the school environment. To prevent the segregation of students with EBD, integration into mainstreamed settings should be encouraged to the greatest extent possible. The current study demonstrates a need to identify teacher standards for behaviour to encourage the success of students with EBD within their respective classroom environments. Students with EBD should be afforded the opportunity to receive education in an environment conducive to success and the

identification of teacher standards for behaviour is a necessary first step to facilitate this process.

References

Alberta Education. (1997). Guide to education for students with special needs. Edmonton, Alberta: Author.

Arllen, N. L., Gable, R. A., & Hendrickson, J. M. (1994). Toward an understanding of the origins of aggression. Preventing School Failure, 38 (3), 18-23.

Bassett, D. S., Jackson, L., Ferrell, K. A., Luckner, J., Hagerty, P. J., Bunsen, T., & MacIsaac, D. (1996). Multiple perspectives on inclusive education: Reflections of a university faculty. Teacher Education & Special Education, 19 (4), 355-386.

Bauer, A. M., & Shea, T. M. (1999). Learners with emotional and behavioral disorders: An introduction. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bullock, L. M., Zagar, E. L., Donahue, C. A., & Pelton, G. B. (1985). Teachers' perceptions of behaviorally disordered students in a variety of settings. Exceptional Children, 52 (2), 123-130.

Bunch, G. (1994). Canadian perspectives on inclusive education from there to here: The passage to inclusive education. Exceptionality Education Canada, 4 (3&4), 19-35.

Cartledge, G., & Johnson, C. T. (1996). Inclusive classrooms for students with emotional and behavioral disorders: Critical variables. Theory Into Practice, 35 (1), 51-57.

Cheney, D., & Harvey, V. S. (1994). From segregation to inclusion: One district's program changes for students with emotional/behavioral disorders. Education and Treatment of Children, 17 (3), 332-346.

Coleman, M., Pfeiffer, S., & Oakland, T. (1992). Aggression replacement training with behaviorally disordered adolescents. Behavioral Disorders, 18 (1), 54-66.

Del'Homme, M., Kasari, C., Forness, S. R., & Bagley, R. (1996). Prereferral intervention and students at-risk for emotional and behavioral disorders. Education and Treatment of Children, 19 (3), 272-285.

Dixon-Floyd, I., & Johnson, S. W. (1997). Variables associated with assigning students

to behavioral classrooms. Journal of Educational Research, 91 (2), 123-126.

Duncan, B. B., Forness, S. R., & Hartsough, C. (1995). Students identified as seriously emotionally disturbed in school-based day treatment: Cognitive, psychiatric, and special education characteristics. Behavioral Disorders, 20 (4), 238-252.

Etscheidt, S. (1991). Reducing aggressive behaviour and improving self-control: A cognitive behavioral training program for behaviorally disordered adolescents. Behavioral Disorders, 16 (2), 107-115.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). Educational research: An introduction (6th ed.). New York: Longman Publishers.

Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. K. (1996). Serving all students in inclusive schools: Contrasts in Canadian and U.S. experience. In J. Lupart, A. McKeough, & C. Yewchuck (Eds.), Schools in transition: Rethinking regular and special education (pp. 60-78). Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson Canada.

Glassberg, L. A. (1994). Students with behavioral disorders: Determinants of placement outcomes. Behavioral Disorders, 19 (3), 181-191.

Gresham, F. M., MacMillan, D. L., & Bocian, K. (1996). "Behavioral earthquakes:" Low frequency, salient behavioral events that differentiate students at-risk for behavioral disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 21 (4), 277-292.

Griffin, G. W. (1987). Childhood predictive characteristics of aggressive adolescents. Exceptional Children, 54 (3), 246-252.

Guetzloe, E. (1992). Violent, aggressive, and antisocial students: What are we going to do with them? Preventing School Failure, 36 (3), 4-9.

Hallenback, B. A., & Kauffman, J. M. (1996). Constructing habilitative environments for students with emotional or behavioral disorders: Conlusion to the special issue. Canadian Journal of Special Education, 11 (1), 100-108.

Hendrickson, J. M., Smith, C. R., & Frank, A. R. (1998). Decision making factors

associated with placement of students with emotional and behavioral disorders in restrictive, educational settings. Education and Treatment of Children, 21 (3), 275-302.

Hollinger, J. D. (1987). Social skills for behaviorally disordered children as preparation for mainstreaming: Theory, practice, and new directions. Remedial and Speical Education (RASE), 8 (4), 17-27.

Hutton, J. B. (1985). What reasons are given by teachers who refer problem behavior students? Psychology in the Schools, 22 (1), 79-82.

Jackson, B. (1995). Some issues in the inclusion of students with emotional/behavioral disorders. Canadian Journal of Special Education, 10 (2), 116-135.

Johnson, G. M. (1997). Teachers in the inner-city: Experience-based ratings of factors that place students at risk. Preventing School Failure, 42 (1), 19-26.

Kauffman, J. M., & Wong, K. L. H. (1991). Effective teachers of students with behavioral disorders: Are generic teaching skills enough? Behavioral Disorders, 16 (3), 225-237.

Knapczyk, D. R. (1992). Effects of developing alternative responses on the aggressive behavior of adolescents. Behavioral Disorders, 17 (4), 247-263.

Lewis, T. J., Chard, D., & Scott, T. M. (1994). Full inclusion and the education of children and youth with emotional and behavioral disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 19 (4), 277-293.

Lupart, J., & Webber, C. (1996). Schools in transition: Issues and prospects. In J. Lupart, A. McKeough, & C. Yewchuck (Eds.), Schools in transition: Rethinking regular and special education (pp. 3-39). Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson Canada.

McLeer, S., Pain, K., & Johnson, S. (1993). Do teachers' behavioral expectations effect the transition from a psychiatric program to community and schools? Canadian Journal of Special Education, 9 (1), 48-59.

Meadows, N. B., Neel, R. S., Scott, C. M., & Parker, G. (1994). Academic performance, social competence, and mainstream accommodations: A look at mainstreamed and

nonmainstreamed students with serious behavioral disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 19 (3), 170-180.

Mick, L. B. (1993). Counterpoint to: Choices for integration: Selecting teachers for mainstreamed students with emotional or behavioral disorders. Intervention in School and Clinic, 29 (2), 109-111.

Muscott, H. S. (1995). A process for facilitating the appropriate inclusion of students with emotional/behavioral disorders. Education and Treatment of Children, 18 (3), 369-386.

Muscott, H. S. (1996). Special education teachers' standards for the classroom behavior of students with behavioral disabilities across a variety of cascade placements. Education and Treatment of Children, 19 (3), 300-315.

Muscott, H. S. (1997). Behavioral characteristics of elementary and secondary students with emotional/behavioral disabilities in four different cascade placements. Education and Treatment of Children, 20 (3), 336-356.

Myles, B. S., & Simpson, R. L. (1992). General educators' mainstreaming preferences that facilitate acceptance of students with behavioral disorders and learning disabilities. Behavioral Disorders, 17 (4), 305-315.

Myles, B. S., & Simpson, R. L. (1994a). Prevention and management considerations for aggressive and violent youth. Education and Treatment of Children, 17 (3), 370-384.

Myles, B. S., & Simpson, R. L. (1994b). Understanding and preventing acts of aggression and violence in school-age children and youth. Preventing School Failure, 38 (3), 40-46.

Quinn, M. M., Jannasch-Pennell, A., & Rutherford, R. B., Jr. (1995a). Using peers as social skills training agents for students with antisocial behavior: A cooperative learning approach. Preventing School Failure, 39 (4), 26-31.

Quinn, M. M., Mathur, S. R., & Rutherford, R. B., Jr. (1995b). Early identification of antisocial boys: A multi-method approach. Education and Treatment of Children, 18 (3), 272-

281.

Ritter, D. R. (1989). Teachers' perceptions of problems behavior in general and special education. Exceptional Children, 55 (6), 559-564.

Roberts, R., & Mather, N. (1995). The return of students with learning disabilities to regular classrooms: A sellout? Learning Disabilities Practice, 10 (1), 46-58.

Rock, E. E., Rosenberg, M. S., & Carran. D. T. (1995). Variables affecting the reintegration rate of students with serious emotional disturbance. Exceptional Children, 61 (3), 255-268.

Schneider, B. H., & Leroux, J. (1994). Educational environments for the pupil with behavioral disorders: A "best evidence" synthesis. Behavioral Disorders, 19 (3), 192-204.

Schwean, V. L., Saklofske, D. H., Shatz, E., & Falk, G. (1996). Achieving supportive integration for children with behavioral disorders in Canada: Multiple paths to realization. Canadian Journal of Special Education, 11 (1), 33-50.

Sharpe, M. N., York, J. L., & Knight, J. (1994). Effects of inclusion on the academic performance of classmates without disabilities. Remedial and Special Education (RASE), 15 (5), 281-287.

Shriner, J. G., Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., & Honetschlager, D. (1994). "All" means "all" - Including students with disabilities. Educational Leadership, 51 (6), 38-42.

Soodak, L. C., Podell, D. M., & Lehman, L. R. (1998). Teacher, student, and school attributes as predictors of teachers' responses to inclusion. The Journal of Special Education, 31 (4), 480-497.

Stainback, S. B., & Stainback, W. C. (1996). Merging regular and special education: Turning classrooms into inclusive communities. In J. Lupart, A. McKeough, & C. Yewchuck (Eds.), Schools in transition: Rethinking regular and special education (pp. 43-59). Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson Canada.

Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S., Jallad, B., Slusher, J., & Saumell, L. (1996). Teachers'

views of inclusion. Learning Disabilities Practice, 11 (2), 96-106.

Walker, H. M., & Lamon, W. E. (1987). Social behavior standards and expectations of Australian and U.S. teacher groups. The Journal of Special Education, 21 (3), 56-82.

Walker, H. M., Shinn, M. R., O'Neill, R. E., & Ramsey, E. (1987). A longitudinal assessment of the development of antisocial behavior in boys: Rationale, methodology, and first-year results. Remedial and Special Education (RASE), 8 (4), 7-16.

Ward, J., & Le Dean, L. (1996). Student teacher's attitudes towards special education provision. Educational Psychology, 16 (2), 207-218.

Warr-Leeper, G., Wright, N. A., & Mack, A. (1994). Language disorders of antisocial boys in residential treatment. Behavioral Disorders, 19 (3), 159-169.

Wehby, J. H. (1994). Issues in the asessment of aggressive behaviour. Preventing School Failure, 38 (3), 24-28.

Wehby, J. H., Symons, F. J., & Shores, R. E. (1995). A descriptive analysis of aggressive behavior in classrooms for children with emotional and behavioral disorders. Behavioral Disorders, 20 (2), 87-105.

Winzer, M. (1996). Children with exceptionalities in Canadian classrooms (4th ed.). Scarborough, Ontario: Allyn & Bacon Canada.

Wong, K. L. H., Kauffman, J. M., & Lloyd, J. W. (1991). Choices for integration: Selecting teachers for mainstreamed students with emotional or behavioral disorders. Intervention in School and Clinic, 27 (2), 108-115.

Wong, K. L. H., Kauffman, J. M., & Lloyd, J. W. (1993). A rejoinder: Choices for integration. Intervention in School and Clinic, 29 (2), 112-113.

Appendix A

Letter of Permission to Utilize Questionnaire

Rivier College

A Catholic liberal education for social justice

October 30, 1999

Heidi Moen
10625 122nd Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5N 1M7, Canada

Here me second try!
Original was sent 10/30.
Didn't know what happened!

Dear Heidi:

It was a pleasure speaking to you recently about your masters thesis in Educational Psychology at the University of Alberta in Edmonton. I am honored that you and Dr. Jack Goldberg have decided to replicate my work on teacher standards across placements for students with emotional disorders. I believe that the question of differential standards still has relevance with respect to the responsible reintegration of students with challenging behavior.

As I told you over the phone, I would be willing to assist in any way possible including the sharing of the instrument as you requested. You have my permission to use and duplicate the enclosed Classroom Participation Scale: Teachers Standards Form for your masters thesis. Please note that you would need to change the placement name (e.g., resource room) and the instructional level (e.g., elementary, middle, etc.) for each different placement you use in your research.

Remember to send me a copy of your review of the literature or proposal to read and keep me informed as your proceed in the process. I would be willing to discuss the interpretations of the results or any other pertinent issue should you and Dr. Goldberg decide that it would be helpful. By the way, if Dr. Goldberg is planning to be at the International CEC Conference in April, 2000 in Vancouver I would be happy to meet with him there.

Best of luck in the weeks and months ahead.

Sincerely,

Howard S. Muscott, Ed.D.,
Associate Professor of Education
Director of Undergraduate Special Education and
Graduate Programs in Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities

cc: Dr. Abraham J. Tannenbaum

420 Main Street • Nashua, NH 03060-5086 • tel: (603) 888-1311 • web: http://www.rivier.edu

Appendix B

Introduction Letter

University of Alberta

Heidi Moen,

Faculty of Educational

Psychology,

Graduate Studies

February 22, 2000

Dear Teacher-Research Participant,

I am a graduate student at the University of Alberta working on my thesis research, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education. My research goal is to assess the standards teachers hold for the behaviour of students with behaviour disorders, according to specific educational placements. Specifically, the research will look at the expectations teachers have for students within their classrooms, in order to deem particular placements as appropriate and successful. The attached survey instrument deals with identifying what specific patterns of behaviour teachers expect of students with behaivour disorders, within either the general education classroom or within a special class. The results of this study will help to identify what specific behaviours can be integrated into the educational programs of students with behaviour disorders, to increase the likelihood of their successful integration within both their current level of educational placement and within less restrictive settings. This project

is, therefore, primarily exploratory in nature.

I would like you to be included in this study, and am interested in obtaining your responses because of your unique experiences with students with behaviour disorders. The information you provide will contribute to a further understanding of factors that improve the successful integration of students with behaviour disorders. The enclosed instrument will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

In addition to your responses to the enclosed document, I am asking a comparison group of participants, who teach students with behaviour disorders in either a general education classroom or a special class, a similar set of questions regarding their expectations for the behaviours of these students. Their responses will serve as a basis for comparison, to further determine how teacher standards for behaviour differ across the placement continuum. Differences between teachers from either of the two placement settings will provide insight as to both the positive and negative factors associated with successful integration of students with behaviour disorders.

Participation in this project is voluntary and, if you decide to participate, you have the right to withdraw from the project at *any* time without penalty. Any information collected for this project will be treated confidentially, and will be discussed only with my immediate thesis supervisor. All possible safeguards will be implemented to protect your anonymity. The use of pseudonyms and/or numerical coding will help to protect your identity from myself, as the principal researcher, from my immediate supervisor, and from others. If there is any information requested in the questionnaire with which you feel uncomfortable responding to, please feel free to not respond to those items.

Any information identifying you to this project will be destroyed upon completion of this

research. In addition, you will not be identifiable in any documents resulting from this project. At the completion of the research project, you may have access to the final findings and report.

I would appreciate it if you will complete the enclosed form prior to February 29, 2000, and return it in the envelope enclosed. I would welcome any comments that you may have concerning the content of this instrument.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, (Heidi Moen, 454-2408), or my university thesis supervisor (Dr. Jack Goldberg, 492-3740). You will be offered a copy of this consent form to keep.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understood the information provided above, and that you willingly agree to participate.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Heidi Moen, M.Ed. Candidate

_____ _____

Signature Date

Appendix C

University of Alberta

Research Consent Form

I, _____, hereby agree to complete the Classroom Participation Scale: Teacher Standards Instrument provided by Heidi Moen.

I understand that:

- I may withdraw from the research at any time without penalty
- all information gathered will be treated confidentially and discussed only between Heidi and her supervisor
- any information that identifies me will be destroyed upon completion of this research
- I will not be identifiable in any documents resulting from this research

I also understand that the results of this research will be used only in the following:

- research thesis
- written articles for the Edmonton Public School District

_____

signature

Date signed: _____

For further information concerning the completion of the form, please contact (Heidi Moen, 454-

2408 or Dr. Jack Goldberg, 492-3740).

Appendix D

Background Information Form

CLASSROOM PARTICIPATION SCALE: TEACHER STANDARDS INSTRUMENT

(CPS: TSI)

Abraham J. Tannenbaum & Howard S. Muscott (1986)

Please Answer the Following Questions

Background Information (Strict Confidentiality Will Be Maintained)

1. Initials _____ Date _____
2. Gender ( ) Male ( ) Female
3. Current School _____
4. Current Teaching Position

Level

_____ Preschool/Kindergarten _____ Grade 1

_____ Grade 2 _____ Grade 3

_____ Grade 4 _____ Grade 5

_____ Grade 6 _____ Other _____

Type

_____ Regular Class

_____ Resource Room

_____ Special Class, Regular School

5. Age _____
6. University Degree(s) Completed

_____ Bachelor's _____ Master's

_____ Doctorate _____Other

7. Presently working towards advanced degree? ( ) Yes _( ) No

   If yes, your major field of study _____

8. Teaching Certificates Held _____

9. Teaching Experience

   # of Years Total_____ # of Years in Current Position _____

   # of Years Teaching Emotionally Disturbed, Behaviourally Disordered, or Socially Maladjusted Students _____

10. Professional Organizations to Which You Currently Belong

    _____

    _____

Appendix E

Classroom Participation Scale: Teacher Standards Instrument

CLASSROOM PARTICIPATION SCALE: TEACHER STANDARDS INSTRUMENT

(CPS: TSI)

Abraham J. Tannenbaum & Howard S. Muscott (1986)[1]

Rating Instructions

THIS FORM IS TO BE FILLED OUT BY A TEACHER WHO IS EMPLOYED IN:

A GENERAL EDUCATION CLASSROOM

In this survey, I would like to determine the amount of certain child behaviours that would be consistent with the child's placement level on the continuum of special education services at which you currently teach.

Please examine the following 40 descriptors of classroom behaviours carefully. For each description, mark an "x" to reflect your standards for the amount of behaviour that children assigned to your classroom **should** exhibit in order for you to consider the placement an appropriate one.

Any frequency different from the one you suggest for your classroom level would be inappropriate in your opinion. This means that you feel a child who exhibits the behaviour at a more or less frequent rate would be more appropriately placed in either a more or less restrictive classroom on the continuum of educational services.

In helping you complete the following rating scale, consider the following descriptions and explanations of ratings:

	Always	NearlyAlways	Frequently	Occasionally	HardlyEver	Never
	100% of the time	Between 90-99% of the time	Between 50-90% of the time	Between 10-50% of the time	Between 1-10% of the time	0%of the time
Behaviour on field trips: The student exhibits appropriate behaviour in the community on field						

[1] Copyrigbt 1986 by A. J. Tannenbaum and H. S. Muscott. Adapted with permission.

trips (e.g. follows teachers' directions, stays with class, etc.)	( )	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )

Teacher A, an elementary resource room teacher, has indicated that students assigned to her classroom should nearly always be able to act appropriately on field trips. One could assume that Teacher A believes that children who can always act appropriately on field trips might be considered as appropriate for a regular classroom setting. On the other hand, Teacher A believes that a child who exhibits appropriate behaviour on filed trips at a rate less than 90% of the time might be more appropriately placed in a self-contained classroom or more restrictive placement.

	Always 100% of the time	NearlyAlways Between 90-99% of the time	Frequently Between 50-90% of the time	Occasionally Between 10-50% of the time	HardlyEver Between 1-10% of the time	Never 0%of the time
Self-abusive behaviour The student engages in Behaviour such as head Banging, biting (him) herself, etc. when provoked by other children.	( )	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )

Teacher B, who teaches at a special school for handicapped children, has indicated that his tolerance level for self-abusive behaviour is occasionally. One could assume Teacher B feels that children who exhibit self-abusive behaviour at a more frequent rate would be more appropriately placed in a more restrictive educational setting. On the other hand, a child who engages in self-abusive behaviour less frequently than 10% of the time might be more appropriately educated in a less restrictive placement such as a special class at a regular elementary school.

CLASSROOM PARTICIPATION SCALE: TEACHER STANDARDS INSTRUMENT

(CPS: TSI)

Abraham J. Tannenbaum & Howard S. Muscott (1986)

Rating Instructions

THIS FORM IS TO BE FILLED OUT BY A TEACHER WHO IS EMPLOYED IN:

A SPECIAL EDUCATION CLASSROOM

In this survey, I would like to determine the amount of certain child behaviours that would be consistent with the child's placement level on the continuum of special education services at which you currently teach.

Please examine the following 40 descriptors of classroom behaviours carefully. For each description, mark an "x" to reflect your standards for the amount of behaviour that children assigned to your classroom **should** exhibit in order for you to consider the placement an appropriate one.

Any frequency different from the one you suggest for your classroom level would be inappropriate in your opinion. This means that you feel a child who exhibits the behaviour at a more or less frequent rate would be more appropriately placed in either a more or less restrictive classroom on the continuum of educational services.

In helping you complete the following rating scale, consider the following descriptions and explanations of ratings:

	Always 100% of the time	NearlyAlways Between 90-99% of the time	Frequently Between 50-90% of the time	Occasionally Between 10-50% of the time	HardlyEver Between 1-10% of the time	Never 0%of the time
Behaviour on field trips: The student exhibits appropriate behaviour in the community on field trips (e.g. follows teachers' directions, stays with class, etc.)	( )	(X)	( )	( )	( )	( )

Teacher A, an elementary resource room teacher, has indicated that students assigned to her classroom should nearly always be able to act appropriately on field trips. One could assume that

Teacher A believes that children who can <u>always</u> act appropriately on field trips might be considered as appropriate for a regular classroom setting. On the other hand, Teacher A believes that a child who exhibits appropriate behaviour on filed trips at a rate less than 90% of the time might be more appropriately placed in a self-contained classroom or more restrictive placement.

	Always	NearlyAlways	Frequently	Occasionally	HardlyEver	Never
	100% of the time	Between 90-99% of the time	Between 50-90% of the time	Between 10-50% of the time	Between 1-10% of the time	0%of the time
Self-abusive behaviour The student engages in Behaviour such as head Banging, biting (him) herself, etc. when provoked by other children.	( )	(X)	(-)	( )	( )	( )

Teacher B, who teaches at a special school for handicapped children, has indicated that his tolerance level for self-abusive behaviour is <u>occasionally</u>. One could assume Teacher B feels that children who exhibit self-abusive behaviour at a more frequent rate would be more appropriately placed in a more restrictive educational setting. On the other hand, a child who engages in self-abusive behaviour less frequently than 10% of the time might be more appropriately educated in a less restrictive placement such as a special class at a regular elementary school.

Classroom Participation Scale: Standards, Page 1

For each description, mark an "x" to reflect your standards for the amount of behaviour that children assigned to your classroom *should* exhibit in order for you to consider the placement an appropriate one.

	Always 100% of the time	NearlyAlways Between 90-99% of the time	Frequently Between 50-90% of the time	Occasionally Between 10-50% of the time	HardlyEver Between 1-10% of the time	Never 0%of the time
1. Starting work under supervision: Under the teacher's direction, he(she) begins an assignment without resistance or distraction.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. Starting work independently: When he(she) is given a familiar or routine assignment that he(she) is able to carry out, he(she) will initiate the assignment without further distraction.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. Finishing work independently: Once he(she) gets started on assigned independent work, he(she) will complete it without resistance or distraction.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Finishing work under supervision: Once he(she)gets started on assigned supervised work, he(she) will complete it without resistance or distraction.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. Disruptive behaviour: When there is disruptive behaviour in the classroom, he(she)is in the "thick" of it.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. Need for incentives: Engages in instructional activities without the need for external rewards (e.g. prizes, privileges, etc.).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. Transition between activities: In changing from one activity to another, he(she)requires direct and immediate supervision (i.e. by an aduit or companion).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. Accepting behaviour limits: When the teacher sets limits on his(her) behaviour, he(she) accepts the limits (e.g. restricts his(her) movement within the room, the use of materials of the type of activity).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. Starting work under supervision: Under the teacher's direction, he(she) begins an assignment without resistance or distraction.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. Changes in routine: Accepts changes in familiar routine without resistance or disruption (e.g. changes in room arrangement, activity, schedule, or teacher).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Classroom Participation Scale: Standards, Page 2

For each description, mark an "X" to reflect your standards for the amount of behaviour that children assigned to your classroom *should* exhibit in order for you to consider the placement an appropriate one.

	Always 100% of the time	NearlyAlways Between 90-99% of the time	Frequently Between 50-90% of the time	Occasionally Between 10-50% of the time	HardlyEver Between 1-10% of the time	Never 0%of the time
11. Reaction to criticism: Evidences exaggerated responses to teacher's suggestions (i.e. explodes in anger, sulks, or shows indifference).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. Seeking help from others: Asks for no more or less help than he(she)seems to need of teachers or classmates.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. Relationship to classmates: Is successful in forming friendships with a large number of his(her) classmates.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
14. Working with classmates: When other students seek his(her)involvement in assigned or approved classroom activities and the situation permits his (her) participation, he (she) participates.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
15. Interacting with classmates: When interacting with other students in class, he(she) uses aggressive physical contacts (e.g. pulls, pushes, hits) or loud, harsh verbal attack (e.g. yells, swears).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
16. Taking turns: In activity which requires him(her) to take turns, he (she) attempts to get ahead of another student.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
17. Sharing materials: When asked, he(she) shares materials and equipment with classmates.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
18. Helping others: When another student near him(her) is having difficulty in using materials and equipment, he(she) volunteers to help.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
19. Accepting help from other children: When he(she) is having difficulty in an activity and one of his(her) peers offers to help, he(she) accepts the help.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Classroom Participation Scale: Standards, Page 3

For each description, mark an "x" to reflect your standards for the amount of behaviour that children assigned to your classroom *should* exhibit in order for you to consider the placement an appropriate one.

	Always	NearlyAlways	Frequently	Occasionally	HardlyEver	Never
	100% of the time	Between 90-99% of the time	Between 50-90% of the time	Between 10-50% of the time	Between 1-10% of the time	0%of the time
20. Reaction to frustration: When he(she) does not get what he(she) wants or things are not going well, he(she) becomes disruptive or sulks.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
21. Borrowing: When he(she) wishes to use another's material, he(she) asks permission.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
22. Pride in work: After successfully producing a tangible piece of schoolwork he(she) shows visible pride in the product (e.g. saves it outside of class, shows it to others).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
23. Returning property: When he(she) has borrowed something, he(she)can be counted on to return the property to its owner without being reminded.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
24. Care of materials: He(she) can be relied on to use materials and equipment without damaging or wasting them deliberately.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
25. Using materials safely: When using materials and equipment, he(she)does so with regard to the safety of others near him(her) (e.g. doesn't swing materials through the air or tip over equipment).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
26. Seeking attention: Tries to call attention to him(her) self in the classroom.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
27. Persistence: He(she) is persistent in trying to solve problems that seem within his(her) grasp.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
28. Response to competition: He(she) is able to engage in activities having a reasonable degree of competition without becoming unduly upset (i.e. sulking, lashing out, or breaking up the activity).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
29. Reaction to leadership of others: When involved in a group activity led by a peer, he(she) can accept a subordinate role.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Classroom Participation Scale: Standards, Page 4

For each description, mark an "x" to reflect your standards for the amount of behaviour that children assigned to your classroom *should* exhibit in order for you to consider the placement an appropriate one.

	Always 100% of the time	NearlyAlways Between 90-99% of the time	Frequently Between 50-90% of the time	Occasionally Between 10-50% of the time	HardlyEver Between 1-10% of the time	Never 0% of the time
30. Assuming leadership roles: He(she) can accept leadership responsibilities in a small group.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
31. Reaction to classroom performance: He(she) is indifferent to whether he(she) succeeds or fails as a student.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
32. Behaviour in public places: When taken to public places with a group, he(she)evidences exaggerated behaviour (i.e. showing off, yelling, or fearfulness).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
33. Relating socially to teachers: Is friendly toward his(her) teachers.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
34. Deviousness: Will use sly, crafty means to outwit people or get what he(she) wants (e.g. works behind peoples' backs for personal gain, tells falsehoods about others).	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
35. Physical appearance: Is concerned about his(her) grooming and will attempt to dress in accordance with hi(her)own best taste.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
36. Self-assertiveness: Is usually unassertive (e.g. easily pushed around, does not object when denied things due him her) does not take a turn without being led or coaxed.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
37. Seeks punishment: Puts him(her)self in a position where he(she) can be easily hurt by verbal or physical abuse.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
38. Physical contact: Will not engage in activities with other children in which some physical contact is required and in which there is no real danger of getting hurt.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
39. Attentiveness: Does not require repetition of instructions on routines such as schedules, assignments, and sequences of activities.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
40. Willingness to assume responsibility: Willingly assumes responsibility for routines and activities which are within his(her) capabilities.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Appendix F

Mean Questionnaire Item Ratings

Mean Questionnaire Item Ratings for Regular and Special Education Teachers

Variable	Total Group	General	Special
Item 1			
M	2.55	2.20	3.31
SD	.94	.72	.95
Item 2			
M	2.58	2.31	3.20
SD	.86	.80	.68
Item 3			
M	2.78	2.51	3.40
SD	.91	.78	.91
Item 4			
M	2.46	2.23	3.00
SD	.93	.84	.93
Item 5			
M	2.91	2.45	3.80
SD	1.20	.99	1.08
Item 6			
M	3.00	2.71	3.71
SD	1.30	1.22	1.27
Item 7			

M	3.38	3.20	3.80
SD	1.28	1.28	1.21
Item 8			
M	2.44	2.06	3.33
SD	1.03	.76	1.05
Item 10			
M	2.50	2.23	3.13
SD	.81	.60	.92
Item 11			
M	2.69	2.31	3.50
SD	1.19	1.08	1.03
Item 12			
M	2.76	2.64	3.00
SD	1.07	1.14	.89
Item 13			
M	2.90	2.57	3.67
SD	1.11	.98	1.05
Item 14			
M	2.61	2.26	3.38
SD	1.08	.95	.96
Item 15			
M	1.98	1.63	2.75
SD	1.10	.81	1.29
Item 16			
M	2.76	2.37	3.63
SD	1.34	1.33	.89

Item 17			
M	2.22	2.06	2.60
SD	.91	.80	1.06
Item 18			
M	2.80	2.69	3.06
SD	1.10	1.21	.77
Item 19			
M	2.51	2.24	3.06
SD	1.04	1.00	.93
Item 20			
M	2.63	2.11	3.75
SD	1.34	1.08	1.18
Item 21			
M	1.94	1.63	2.63
SD	1.12	.94	1.20
Item 22			
M	2.47	2.31	2.81
SD	.86	.76	.98
Item 23			
M	2.29	2.00	2.94
SD	1.10	.97	1.12
Item 24			
M	2.14	1.69	3.13
SD	1.04	.72	.96
Item 25			
M	2.04	1.60	3.00

SD	1.15	.85	1.15
Item 26			
M	3.06	2.63	4.00
SD	1.24	1.19	.73
Item 27			
M	2.86	2.40	3.88
SD	1.04	.77	.81
Item 28			
M	2.59	2.23	3.38
SD	1.13	.91	1.20
Item 29			
M	2.69	2.37	3.38
SD	1.12	.94	1.20
Item 30			
M	3.16	2.83	3.88
SD	1.10	.98	1.02
Item 31			
M	2.39	2.14	2.94
SD	1.06	.85	1.29
Item 32			
M	2.16	1.71	3.13
SD	1.29	.89	1.50
Item 33			
M	2.30	2.11	2.73
SD	.99	.99	.88
Item 34			

M	2.24	1.69	3.44
SD	1.38	.99	1.36
Item 35			
M	2.83	2.39	3.69
SD	1.07	.80	1.01
Item 36			
M	2.49	2.30	2.88
SD	.92	.85	.96
Item 37			
M	2.00	1.65	2.75
SD	1.20	.98	1.29
Item 38			
M	2.29	2.12	2.63
SD	1.00	1.05	.81
Item 39			
M	3.29	2.89	4.19
SD	1.40	1.35	1.11
Item 40			
M	2.47	2.11	3.25
SD	1.01	.83	.93

Note. Item 9 was removed from the analysis due to an error on the part of the principal researcher.